COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

Volume X FALL 1958 Number 4

Heine and the Saint-Simonians: A Re-examination. By Georg G. Iggers 289

The Madness of Hercules and the Elizabethans. By Rolf Soellner 309

The Modern Hero: Phoenix or Ashes? By Edith Kern 325

A German Imitation of Fielding: Müsaus' *Grandison der Zweite*. By Guy Stern 335

The "Truth" in John Ford's *The Broken Heart*. By Giovanni M. Carsaniga 344

Moby Dick in Germany. By Leland R. Phelps 349

Book Reviews 356

The Poetry of Experience, by Robert Langbaum (J. B. Hall). *The Flaming Heart*, by Mario Praz (C. B. Beall). *Le Dandysme en France*, by John C. Prevost (Alfred G. Engstrom). *Rainer Maria Rilke. Lettres Milanaises*, ed. by Renée Lang (Georgette Schuler). *Franz Kafka Today*, ed. by Angel Flores and Homer Swander (Jorge Elliott). *Style in the French Novel*, by Stephen Ullmann (Leo Spitzer). *Taras Shevchenko and Western European Literature*, by Jurij Bojko (Yar Slavutych). *Federico García Lorca*, by Jean-Louis Schonberg (Bernardo Gicovate). *Shakespeares Dramen*, by Max Lüthi (Christof Wegelin).

Varia 375

A propos du *Malentendu*, by Maria Kosko. Books Received.

PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON, EUGENE, OREGON

With the Cooperation of the Comparative Literature Section of the Modern Language Association of America

Issued quarterly. Entered as second-class matter, April 5, 1949, at the post office at Eugene, Oregon, under act of August 24, 1912.

Comparative Literature

Editor

CHANDLER B. BEALL
University of Oregon
Eugene, Ore.

Associate Editor

WERNER P. FRIEDERICH
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, N.C.

Assistant Editor

PERRY J. POWERS
University of Oregon
Eugene, Ore.

Editorial Board

FRANCIS FERGUSSON
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, N.J.

VICTOR LANGE
Princeton University
Princeton, N.J.

HELMUT HATZFELD
Catholic University
Washington, D.C.

HARRY LEVIN
Harvard University
Cambridge, Mass.

RENÉ WELLEK
Yale University
New Haven, Conn.

FOUNDED at a time when the strengthening of good international relations is of paramount importance, *Comparative Literature* provides a forum for those scholars and critics who are engaged in the study of literature from an international point of view. Its editors define comparative literature in the broadest possible manner, and accept articles dealing with the manifold interrelations of literatures, with the theory of literature, movements, genres, periods, and authors—from the earliest times to the present. They particularly welcome longer studies on comparative topics and on problems of criticism.

Manuscripts, editorial communications, and books for review should be addressed to: Comparative Literature, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

The subscription rate is $3.50 a year. The price of single copies is $1.00. Complete back sets are available for sale or exchange. Correspondence concerning subscriptions should be addressed to: University of Oregon Publications, Eugene, Oregon. Correspondence concerning exchanges should be addressed to: University of Oregon Library, Eugene, Oregon.

Indexed in International Index to Periodicals.

Autres livres à télécharger sur le site
https://abbassa.wordpress.com

COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

VOLUME X FALL 1958 NUMBER 4

HEINE AND THE SAINT-SIMONIANS: A RE-EXAMINATION

GEORG G. IGGERS

SINCE Strodtmann, a few years after the poet's death, wrote the first important biography of Heine,[1] critics generally have recognized the great influence which the Saint-Simonians exerted upon Heine's thought and writing during his first few years in France. In Saint-Simonianism, it is agreed, Heine found in the early 1830s a solution to the religious problems which had disturbed him during the 1820s. The conflicts between his "Hellenic" and "Nazarene" affinities, between rationalistic and poetic impulses, between aristocratic and democratic sentiments, were now resolved by an adherence to the "new religion" which drew him to France.

During the next five years, Saint-Simonian ideas seem to dominate his entire literary work. *Die romantische Schule* and *Zur Geschichte der Religion und Philosophie in Deutschland* were both consciously written as Saint-Simonian interpretations of German intellectual history (the latter was written at the suggestion of Prosper Enfantin); and the *Gemäldeausstellung* in 1831 and the last three letters of the *Französische Zustände* clearly reflect Saint-Simonian influence. Nevertheless, despite his self-identification with the Saint-Simonians, his use of Saint-Simonian concepts, and his close friendship with Michel Chevalier and others connected with the movement, Heine cannot be called a full-fledged Saint-Simonian. A number of difficulties intervene:

(1) Does the Saint-Simonian interlude have organic ties either to Heine's earlier or to his later religious or political views, as the biographers and critics have maintained? Around 1830, upon first acquaintance with the new doctrine, Heine seems to have found in it a

[1] Adolf Strodtmann, *H. Heine's Leben und Werke* (Berlin, 1867-69), II, 284-319.

synthesis of the two aspects of his own nature. But the synthesis seems to have disintegrated in the *Florentinische Nächte* and in the polemic against Börne.

(2) Can Heine, the champion of freedom of thought and political liberty, be considered the ally of a movement which saw in "freedom of conscience" the basic cause of the decadence of modern society and which advocated the most systematically authoritarian society yet conceived?

(3) How can we account for what E. M. Butler, in her systematic study of Heine and the Saint-Simonians, has called a conspiracy of silence?[2] Heine had personal relationships with the Saint-Simonians, attended public meetings and soirées, and indisputably was influenced by Saint-Simonian ideas in at least two works. Nevertheless, except for Enfantin's letter to Heine upon receipt of the French edition of *De l'Allemagne* and a few articles on Heine in the *Globe*, virtually no mention of Heine appears in Saint-Simonian writings.[3] And, except for reference to, and use of, certain Saint-Simonian terms, Heine makes few specific references to the movement in his books and correspondence; and, when he does refer to the group as a group, it is usually with irony.[4] Significantly, he almost completely ignores the inner crises in the movement at a time of dramatic conflict within the Saint-Simonian church.

The weakness of previous studies of this relationship is due to the lack of thorough acquaintance with Saint-Simonian thought. Except for Margaret Clarke,[5] Heine scholars have made only limited use of Saint-Simonian sources and have not read thoroughly the political writings of the movement. Yet the religious views and aesthetic theories of the school, as recent students of Saint-Simonianism have increas-

---

[2] E. M. Butler, *The Saint-Simonian Religion in Germany, A Study of the Young German Movement* (Cambridge, 1926), pp. 89-90.

[3] Except for Enfantin's letter to Heine (*Œuvres de Saint-Simon et d'Enfantin*, Paris, 1865-78, X, 108-136) and a letter attributed to Heine in which the author expresses his high opinion of the Saint-Simonian doctrine while emphasizing that he neither is nor ever can become a Saint-Simonian (*Œuvres*, VI, 108), only two unimportant mentions of Heine occur in the *Œuvres*: X, 140 and XI, 109.

[4] Regarding Saint-Simonian immunity from cholera, see Heine's *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. Ernst Elster (Leipzig, Vienna, 1890), V, 103; regarding the miracle of Saint-Simon's tailor bill, see IV, 192. Heine expressed himself very sarcastically to Heinrich Laube (see *Gespräche mit Heine*, ed. H. H. Houben, Frankfurt, 1926, pp. 336-337) and repeatedly repudiated identification with the movement. See Heine, *Briefe*, ed. Friedrich Hirth (Mainz, 1950-51), II, 71; *Sämtliche Werke*, V, 527.

[5] Margaret A. Clarke, *Heine et la monarchie de Juillet. Étude sur les Franzoesische Zustaende suivie d'une étude sur le saint-simonisme chez Heine* (Paris, 1927), quotes from and refers extensively to Saint-Simonian writings on aesthetic theory.

ingly realized,[6] were not only closely interwoven with the political theories of the movement but were necessary results of the political theories. In the last analysis, Saint-Simonianism was a political ideology rather than a religion, founded on premises which were basically unacceptable to Heine and, for that matter, to the Young Germans. The Young Germans and Heine used Saint-Simonian religious and aesthetic concepts and even on occasions political concepts—but with very different and far more liberal intentions than those of the Saint-Simonians themselves.

In the early 1830s, Saint-Simonianism represented a systematic philosophy of human relations rather than a mere conglomeration of eccentric ideas. The basic aim of the movement was the systematic organization of all human activities under a centralized hierarchical authority. This ideology is not simply identifiable with that of Henri de Saint-Simon.[7] His was the inspiration, but he never developed a system. In the prolific literary output of the last two decades of his life, Saint-Simon's political and social thought passed through several distinct phases, in each of which he stressed different although not always contradictory ideas.[8]

In the first phase, beginning with the *Lettres d'un habitant de Genève à ses contemporains* (1803), Saint-Simon saw the history of man as the progressive replacement of supernatural religious conceptions by a new scientific religion of "physicism"—the creation of a social physiology as an exact science which would serve as the basis of a scientifically organized society. With the Restoration, Saint-Simon came to consider political economy (rather than physiology) as the scientific basis of a rational social organization, and became a champion of political and economic liberalism and of cosmopolitanism. This liberalism was soon modified by the view that, since politics was the science of production, some regulation of private property in terms of industrial production and social welfare might be required. The belief that society must have a new religion of brotherhood found its most articulate expression in the *Nouveau Christianisme,* published a few weeks before his death. God revealed himself progressively, Saint-Simon said; the Christian revelation was yet imperfect because it separated the realms

[6] See F. A. Hayek, *The Counter-Revolution of Science. Studies on the Abuses of Reason* (Glencoe, Ill., 1952), and Georg G. Iggers, *The Cult of Authority (The Political Philosophy of the Saint-Simonians. A Chapter in the Intellectual History of Totalitarianism)* (The Hague, 1958), *passim.*

[7] The term Saint-Simonian will be used in this article to distinguish the theories of the organized followers of Saint-Simon after his death from those of their master.

[8] For a systematic analysis of Saint-Simon's ideological development, see Henri Gouhier's, *La Jeunesse d'Auguste Comte et la formation du positivisme* (Paris, Lille, 1933-41), vols. II and III, and Frank Manuel's *The New World of Henri Saint-Simon* (Cambridge, Mass., 1956).

of Caesar and Christ. The New Christianity, based on the precept of brotherly love, would preach and strive for "the speediest improvement of the moral, intellectual, and physical existence of the poorest and most numerous class." Yet the *Nouveau Christianisme* nowhere espoused the abolition of inheritance, the creation of an authoritarian total state, or the emancipation of women which the Saint-Simonians were to preach later in their master's name.

Saint-Simon's disciples almost ignored the writings of his scientistic and libertarian periods. Only in the short-lived publications, *Le Producteur* (1825-26), to which non-Saint-Simonians, including Auguste Comte,[9] contributed, were his basic concepts of industrial efficiency and rational planning expounded at length. After its suspension, such contributors as Enfantin, Bazard, and Olinde Rodrigues—only the latter had known Saint-Simon personally—and like-minded students from the École Polytechnique attempted to create a well-organized movement with a systematically defined philosophy of society. This movement first took the form of a *collège*, then of a hierarchical church. The basic doctrine of the new religion, which was at least as deeply influenced by Catholic counterrevolutionary thought as by the Enlightenment, contained radically antirationalistic and antilibertarian implications not found in Saint-Simon's writings. It was expounded in a systematic form in a series of biweekly lectures held between December 1828 and mid-1830, and published as the *Doctrine de Saint-Simon. Exposition. Première Année* and *Deuxième Année*.

As viewed in the *Doctrine*, the task of the Saint-Simonians was to put an end to the "permanent anarchy"[10] in which modern society had found itself ever since the Reformation and the French Revolution had destroyed the Christian-feudal institution of the Middle Ages without establishing a new order. The crisis of the modern age was basically one of authority and order; the prerequisite of the restoration of order was the formulation of a general doctrine which "embraces all modes of human activity and offers the solution to all social and individual problems."[11] Historically, societies fell into two types: organic societies, basically authoritarian in character, marked by "legitimacy, sovereignty, and authority,"[12] in which all institutions and beliefs rested on

[9] Regarding Comte's influence on the Saint-Simonians, see Georg G. Iggers, introduction to *The Doctrine of Saint-Simon, An Exposition* (Boston, 1958), pp. xx, xxii-xxiii; also *Cult of Authority*, pp. 7, 20-24. Cf. Hayek, p. 144. Comte had at one time been Saint-Simon's private secretary but broke with him on the question of religion and, despite his contributions to *Le Producteur*, emphatically disassociated himself from the movement.

[10] *Doctrine de Saint-Simon. Exposition. Première Année. 1829*, ed. C. Bouglé and Élie Halévy (Paris, 1924), p. 124. The "Première séance," pp. 121-156, is devoted to a discussion of the critical character of modern society.

[11] Page 126.

[12] Page 196. For a discussion of the characteristics of organic and critical periods, see also pp. 194-201, 372-373, 384, 409-419, 436-442.

a general doctrine; and critical societies essentially libertarian, characterized by freedom of conscience and by the lack of firmly established intellectual and political authority. The function of critical periods was to destroy yet imperfect organic periods. The institutions of the contemporary age—as manifested by the dominance of the ratio-empirical method in science,[13] *laissez-faire* doctrines in the economy,[14] and the metaphysics of individual rights and constitutionalism in politics[15]—were "critical" in character and must inevitably give way to a new normative, organic society.

History was viewed in the *Doctrine* as a lawful process by which mankind, as a collectivity, develops through the dialectics of organic and critical periods to total organization, to the "universal association or the association of all men on the entire surface of the globe in all spheres of their relationships."[16] This process is accompanied by a decline in antagonism and exploitation. The last vestige of exploitation, the modern wage worker,[17] can be eliminated only by the transformation of property rights—not by equal distribution of the wealth but by the transfer of all inheritance rights to the state.[18] Economic order would be re-established only by complete state ownership through a centralized banking system, "the depository of the entire wealth, of the total fund of production."[19] Cooperating with the banking system would be an educational system with the function of teaching the masses, in a dogmatic form, the "loved, known, and concisely defined"[20] aims of the society, and of assigning all citizens, on the basis of their talents, to their proper places in the social hierarchy.

The key to the organization of the future lay, however, in religion. Religion would not disappear; rather, the entire political order would be transformed into a religious institution.[21] Science could not disprove religion; the areligious or antireligious character of science was merely the result of its function during critical periods of destroying the incomplete faith of a previous epoch.[22] The basic motivating force of science, as of all human development, was the "love of order and of unity";[23] science, thus, became systematic and dogmatic in organic

[13] Pp. 132-133; see also discussions of scientific method, pp. 182-194, 407-408, and the critique of Auguste Comte's *Troisième Cahier du catéchisme des industriels*, pp. 442-457.
[14] Pp. 139-141; see also discussion of economic theorists, pp. 283-317.
[15] Pp. 147, 151; see the rejection of trial by jury, p. 389.
[16] Pp. 203, 204.
[17] Pp. 218, 238.
[18] Pp. 239, 243, 248.
[19] Page 273.
[20] Page 322.
[21] Page 487; cf. p. 403.
[22] Regarding the relation of science and religion, see pp. 401-457.
[23] Page 453.

periods.[24] Yet only the genius attained the fundamental unifying insights of science. Ratio-empirical method would merely discover details or prove the great hypotheses posed by nonrational processes. Religion, rather than being an abstract theological or metaphysical system, was the basic social bond, identical with politics and morals.[25] Its history paralleled that of science and of human institutions in its development from plurality to unity in theory and organization. Christianity in its Roman Catholic form represented religion's highest development but one which, through the separation of the spheres of Caesar and Christ, still fell short of the final unitary association in which all would be part of God and all men in all their activities would form parts of the universal association which the church would represent.[26]

The political character of religion and its authoritarian implications were made even clearer in the *Deuxième Année*. Every theological or metaphysical belief has to have a social basis of reference.[27] Politics, rather than dealing merely with the prevention of violence on the part of the state, embraces the entire social order. Instead of being limited, the powers of government should be expanded.[28] The true society has to be organized hierarchically; where there is no hierarchy, there is no society, but merely an aggregation of individuals.[29]

These ideas were repeated in the columns of the daily *Globe* (acquired by the Saint-Simonians in December 1830), in *L'Organisateur*, and in public sermons. Coupled with this repetition were a systematic critique of liberal institutions, constitutional government, civil liberties, and juries, and demands for intellectual control, industrial organization, and financial concentration. The role of the artist as a functionary of society was discussed. The doctrine of the rehabilitation of the flesh, at first developed primarily in its relation to politics and industry, was applied to the question of woman. The radical sexual ideas which Enfantin drew from this doctrine led to a schism within the "church" late in 1831. The ensuing public ridicule and legal persecution soon destroyed Saint-Simonianism as an effective organized movement, although Enfantin and others would continue to preach Saint-Simonian ideas for decades to come.

---

[24] Page 197.

[25] Page 486.

[26] See pp. 220, 232-234. Regarding the historic function of the Catholic Church, see p. 220: "Le clergé catholique présente la première ébauche d'une société fondée sur la combinaison des forces pacifiques, et du sein de laquelle le principe de l'exploitation de l'homme par l'homme ... est complètement exclu ... elle réalise, dans sa hierarchie *terrestre*, un nouveau mode de distribution des fonctions et des grades, non pas selon la *naissance*, mais selon la capacité, selon le mérite personnel."

[27] *Œuvres*, XLII, 298.

[28] *Organisateur*, Sept. 5, 1829.

[29] *Œuvres*, XLII, 325 f.

Heine's political and religious views before his emigration have been thoroughly examined, particularly by Henri Lichtenberger.[30] Except for a brief youthful encounter with romantic nationalism, ending with his expulsion from the Burschenschaft at Göttingen and his increasing awareness of his position as a Jew in the Prussia of the 1820s, his views were in the tradition of the Enlightenment and were dominated by his hatred of *Junker* and *Pfaffen*.[31]

Politically, Heine's faith was not complex and, from 1823 to 1830, basically constant—a pronounced liberalism. The task of our time, he said, is the emancipation of "the whole world" from the "iron chains of privilege, from the aristocracy."[32] Millions of men have not been created to be the beasts of burden of a few thousand privileged knights.[33] Although he idealized the French Revolution and Napoleon, saw in Paris the New Jerusalem,[34] and asserted his belief in popular sovereignty,[35] he conceived the liberal state as a constitutional monarchy. Not the throne but the *Adelgeziefer*[36] was the object of his hatred. For Heine, constitutional monarchy, guaranteeing civil liberties, was the embodiment of liberal principles.[37] Deeply interwoven with this liberalism was a pronounced cosmopolitanism and *Europäertum*.[38] He saw nationalism as an instrument used by greedy princes and the forces of privilege.[39]

Heine's approach to religion was essentially political rather than theological. While he emphasized his appreciation of the aesthetic aspects of Christianity[40] and his awareness of the inner sanctity of religion,[41] he frankly admitted his predilection for indifferentism.[42] A "born enemy of all positive religions,"[43] he saw in the established churches the inevitable cheapening of the religious content through compromises with worldly authorities.[44]

Heine recognized the democratic content in Jesus' teachings, which "revealed that doctrine of freedom and equality" which, like the

30 Henri Lichtenberger, *Henri Heine penseur* (Paris, 1905).
31 *Werke*, III, 494-495.
32 III, 275.
33 III, 494-495.
34 III, 501.
35 III, 504.
36 III, 417.
37 "Einleitung zu 'Kahldorf über den Adel,'" *ibid.*, VII, 280-293; see pp. 292-293.
38 III, 274-275.
39 III, 274; cf. VII, 592; rejection of narrow patriotism, VII, 183; ridicule of patriotism, III, 274.
40 I, 177 f.
41 III, 417; cf. p. 416.
42 *Briefe*, I, 74 (May 3, 1823); cf. I, 463 (Nov. 16, 1830); *Werke*, III, 418.
43 *Briefe*, I, 101 (Aug. 23, 1823); cf. *Werke*, III, 417.
44 *Werke*, III, 417 ff.

"French Gospel, inspires our time with enthusiasm."[45] Nevertheless, he saw in the religious tradition of the Western world an "Egyptian plague"[46] which had stunted the full political and moral development of man. Unlike the Hellenic tradition, which was compatible with tolerance, the Judaeo-Christian tradition meant intolerance, authority, and suffering.[47] The Christian doctrine, he had shown already in 1820 in the tragedy *Almansor,* constituted for him a denial of beauty and human joys.[48] Being contrary to human nature, Christian asceticism inevitably resulted in the "Gothic" lie.[49] Perhaps in the Middle Ages such a religion was necessary for sick mankind,[50] but Christianity had to give way to the progress of the human mind.[51] Regardless of the consolation Catholicism might have offered or of the spirit of social unity it might have produced, church rule, particularly with respect to the intellectual life, meant subjugation of the worst sort.[52] In brief, the state church, the doctrines of Christianity, and political reaction were inextricably interwoven.

In Protestantism, which Heine regarded more as a system of rationalism than as a religion[53] and which he had embraced primarily as a matter of expediency, he admired Luther's assertion of the principle of freedom of conscience in matters of religion; but the real heroes of the Reformation and the true Protestants remained for him Münzer and the peasants who with a Bible in one hand and a sword in the other attempted to make the Gospel teachings a worldly reality.[54]

Despite the fundamental differences between Heine and the Saint-Simonians, there do exist a number of clear affinities between their religious views and even their political opinions. Heine, sensing the aesthetic qualities of religion, rejected the other-worldliness and anti-humaneness of traditional Christianity and at the same time condemned the soullessness of bourgeois materialism. Saint-Simonianism restored the harmony which he yearned for between faith and reason, matter and spirit, practicality and beauty.[55] His faith in progress was satisfied with a philosophy of history which stressed the perfectibility of man in his physical, moral, and intellectual dimensions, and he saw in Christianity a step toward a new religion which embodied a more inclusive conception of man.[56] He wrote to Varnhagen von Ense that fundamen-

[45] III, 419; cf. p. 280.
[46] III, 494-495.
[47] *Werke,* III, 416; cf. *Briefe,* I, 101.
[48] *Werke,* II, 283-289.
[49] III, 318.
[50] III, 92, 395.
[51] III, 92.
[52] III, 93.
[53] III, 326-327.
[54] III, 495-496; V, 156-157.
[55] III, 304.
[56] I, 228; III, 501.

tally only the religious ideas in Saint-Simonianism were of interest to him.[57]

Political disillusionment, especially after the July Revolution of 1830, made Heine realize the social and economic foundations of politics; and the Saint-Simonian demand for equal economic opportunity coupled with an authoritarian emphasis harmonized his democratic convictions with his belief in monarchy and his distrust of the masses. Thus, a close contact could develop between Heine and some of the Saint-Simonians, particularly Michel Chevalier; and the *Globe*, for example, saw in him the German who best understood the Saint-Simonian movement.[58]

Nevertheless, in spite of this recognition of an affinity of ideas, Heine and the Saint-Simonians sensed fundamental differences of view. While he was in France, it is interesting to note, Heine never called himself a Saint-Simonian. And Miss Butler suggests that, since for Heine personality and ideas were generally inseparable, his personal relations with Saint-Simonians may have prevented him later from criticizing Saint-Simonian ideas more extensively than he did.[59]

Heine apparently became acquainted with Saint-Simonianism between the July Revolution and his emigration, when he read part or all of the *Première Année* of the *Doctrine de Saint-Simon*, his "new gospel."[60] In April 1831 he dreamed of traveling to Paris in order "ganz den heiligen Gefühlen meiner neuen Religion mich hinzugeben und vielleicht als Priester derselben die letzten Weihen zu empfangen."[61] Less blindly enthusiastic after personally visiting the sect during his first twenty-four hours in Paris, he nevertheless demonstrated his absorption of Saint-Simonian concepts in *Französische Maler. Gemäldeausstellung in Paris 1831.* These articles on the first art salon since the July Revolution were favorably reviewed by the *Globe*,[62] particularly because Heine followed closely Saint-Simonian methods of criticism.

Viewing art essentially as the product of history and society, Heine considered the traditional art of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, art which received its inspiration from Catholic spiritualism, to have come to an end because its "Prinzip" was rooted in an old régime, the Holy Roman Empire.[63] The great Greek or Florentine artists led no "egoistically isolated art lives"; their works were rather the mirrors of the time that united art with daily politics. In contrast, in the salon

---

[57] *Briefe*, II, 22 (May 1832).
[58] *Globe*, Jan. 2, 1832.
[59] Butler, *op. cit.*, p. 108.
[60] *Briefe*, I, 475-476 (Feb. 10, 1831).
[61] I, 478 (Apr. 1, 1831).
[62] *Globe*, Jan. 2, 1832. Cf. Clarke, pp. 243, ff.; also *Globe*, Dec. 25, 1831, concerning "Kahldorf."
[63] *Werke*, IV, 72.

of 1831 the bond between society and art was missing.[64] There could be no return to the art of Raphael; serious modern artists like Louis Léopold Robert "refuse to recognize the struggle of spirit against matter" or of heaven with earth.[65]

Despite this Saint-Simonian influence, the changed political note in Heine's writings after emigration is more directly attributable to his disillusionment with the July Revolution than to Saint-Simonianism. His ecstatic enthusiasm at Norderney upon hearing the news of the July days[66] was already considerably dampened by the fall of 1830. He then admitted that to see in the nobility and the clergy the only enemies of progress was an incomplete description of the revolution, "which embraces all social interests."[67] Upon his arrival in Paris, he noticed that "things wore really completely different colors,"[68] that the people had merely fought for a new privileged class, the bourgeoisie"[69]—an analysis which, incidentally, was also that of the Saint-Simonians.[70]

In terms of basic political principles, the articles in 1831 and 1832 in the *Augsburger Zeitung*, later published as *Französische Zustände*, show little if any change from Heine's earlier writings. The preface to these articles calls for a league of nations, for the ultimate abolition of standing armies, for peace, prosperity, and freedom.[71] All except the last were aims shared by the Saint-Simonians; but the basic thought of the work, the call for a truly liberal constitutional monarchy free from domination by a nobility or priesthood, or for that matter by the *juste milieu*, was basically un-Saint-Simonian. Emphasizing his monarchical convictions,[72] Heine accused Louis Philippe of having betrayed the July Revolution to the *juste milieu* by forgetting that his government came into being through popular sovereignty.[73] Still believing in the possibility of a popular monarchy, even after the unsuccessful republican uprising of June 5 and 6 consolidated the power of the *juste milieu*, Heine was unwilling to admit that the monarchy inevitably represented certain class interests. "Thue uns Ludwig Philippe . . . den einzigen Gefallen, ein Bürgerkönig zu bleiben."[74]

The entrenchment of conservatism in 1832, Gentz's letter to Cotta complaining of Heine's extremism in his articles in the *Augsburger*

---

[64] IV, 25-26.
[65] IV, 55.
[66] VII, 59-62.
[67] *Briefe*, I, 464-465 (Nov. 19, 1830).
[68] *Werke*, VII, 65 (written nine years later).
[69] VII, 66.
[70] *Organisateur*, Aug. 15 and 27, 1830; Apr. 2, 1831; *Globe*, Jan. 13 and 20, 1831; cf. Iggers, *The Cult of Authority*, pp. 110-114.
[71] *Werke*, V, 11-12.
[72] V, 20, 37.
[73] V, 30.
[74] V, 34.

Zeitung, the *juste-milieu* victory in June, and the German Bundestag decree of June 28, 1832, curbing freedom of expression—these events coincide with a shift in Heine away from active political interests and his introduction of isolated Saint-Simonian concepts. This shift is already apparent in the later letters of the *Französische Zustände*.[75] He now saw the basic political struggle as the struggle of equality against privilege; the reformation of governmental institutions is incidental. Absolutism as well as democracy is compatible with popular sovereignty. Thus, Napoleon was the prototype of a "Saint-Simonian emperor," his army a hierarchy based upon ability.[76] A year later, Heine wrote to Heinrich Laube that the basic political questions concerned not the forms of government but the material well-being of the people.[77] As he became increasingly aware of economic issues, Heine's direct political interest subsided.[78] In the introduction to the French edition of the *Reisebilder* (1834), he wrote that politics must be viewed in class terms, and that the motto of 1789 was outdated; the aristocracy consists not only of those born into it, but of all who live at the expense of the people. A new motto must call for the end of the exploitation of man by man.[79]

In *Die romantische Schule*, written the following winter, and in *Zur Geschichte der Religion und Philosophie in Deutschland*, undertaken on the suggestion of Enfantin, to whom the French edition was dedicated,[80] Saint-Simonian ideas seem to provide an inner organic unity, which makes them unique among Heine's prose writings. The German history of ideas is now interpreted within the framework of a consciously Saint-Simonian philosophy of history; progressively, spiritualism has been overcome by sensualism. Spiritualism is not to be understood in its traditional epistemological meaning but as that "sinful presumptuousness of the spirit" which strives to destroy the natural rights of matter;[81] and sensualism, the opposing principle, is that belief which struggles for the rehabilitation of matter without denying the "rights of the spirit or even its supremacy." The Christian religion, particularly in its Roman Catholic form, through its condemnation of the flesh[82] and its identification of matter with Satan,[83] constitutes a "communicable disease" from which mankind must recover.[84] Hence,

[75] Clarke, pp. 165 ff., sees a clear break in Heine's expressed political opinions beginning with "Artikel VII" of *Franz. Zust.* dated May 12, 1832 (*Werke*, V, 105-116).

[76] *Werke*, V, 194.

[77] *Briefe*, II, 40 (July 10, 1833).

[78] II, 27 (Dec. 19, 1832).

[79] *Werke*, III, 508.

[80] IV, 568.

[81] IV, 185, 208.

[82] V, 217.

[83] IV, 169.

[84] *Ibid.*

the romantic German glorification of the Middle Ages is reactionary.[85] Christianity, a religion of hard times,[86] may have served a historical function as a reaction against the excessive materialism of the late Roman Empire[87] and may have fulfilled a necessary civilizing function for suffering mankind. But Heine questions whether, at our stage of civilization, we still need it.[88] Thanks to intellectual and material progress, mankind can no longer be kept from realizing that it is destined to enjoy not only heavenly but also earthly equality.[89]

The next task of our institutions is the rehabilitation of matter, the restoration of its dignity, its religious sanctification, and its reconciliation with spirit.[90] "The happier and more beautiful generations," conceived in free love and reared in a religion of joy, will smile sadly at their ancestors. Mankind is to be happy and its happiness is to be established on earth through the blessings of free political and industrial institutions.[91] The world is large enough to feed all, "if we all worked and if no one lived at another's expense."[92] The Saint-Simonians understood "something of this kind," but the surrounding materialism suppressed these ideals, at least temporarily. Yet in Germany, whose hidden religion had been pantheistic even during Christian times, these truths were better understood.[93] Thanks to the law of progress in nature, a principle profoundly understood by the Saint-Simonians, pantheism, which recognizes direction in history, need no longer lead to the indifferentism of Goethe.[94] Rather, pantheism possesses political and social implications. Concerned with the well-being of matter (since wretchedness of body destroys the image of God), pantheism turns the revolutionary cry, "le pain est le droit du peuple," into the commandment, "le pain est le droit divin du peuple."[95]

Although Saint-Simonian principles apparently dominate these two Saint-Simonian works, beneath the surface they are thoroughly un-Saint-Simonian, except for the strong concern for social reform. Certain religious concepts already in the 1820s implicit in Heine's criticism of Christianity (particularly the concept of the rehabilitation of the flesh) are used here, apart from the Saint-Simonian philosophy of man and society, to serve Heine's own very different Weltanschauung. Despite their superficial Saint-Simonianism, *Die romantische Schule*

[85] V, 353-357.
[86] IV, 170.
[87] V, 218.
[88] IV, 171.
[89] V, 261.
[90] IV, 221-222.
[91] IV, 170.
[92] V, 328.
[93] IV, 224.
[94] V, 253.
[95] IV, 222-223.

and *Zur Geschichte der Religion und Philosophie in Deutschland* stand essentially in the liberal tradition of the Enlightenment, which the Saint-Simonians condemned as a symptom of the critical age. While Heine moved away from a narrow political conception of constitutional monarchy to a deeper understanding of social and economic forces, he remained basically a democrat and a believer in liberal institutions and intellectual freedom. He used Saint-Simonian religious concepts as weapons against the entrenched traditional German religiosity, which he considered a main obstacle to political revolution.[96] But his political aim still was to establish a German democracy rather than a centralized, authoritarian hierarchy of the capable.

Even Heine's pantheism and his philosophy of history are basically very different from Saint-Simonianism, despite his terminology. If anything, Heine's activism allied him with the left Hegelians. His ascription (which puzzled Miss Butler) of his earlier philosophic opinions to Hegel rather than the Saint-Simonians is understandable.[97] For the Saint-Simonians, religion was a political institution, and pantheism, in its true sense, meant the total organization of society as a church in the form of a trinitarian hierarchy[98] regulating all private and social activities of an intellectual, moral, or industrial character—an authoritarianism thoroughly repulsive to Heine. Nowhere, except in the preface to the French edition of the *Reisebilder*,[99] does he mention any hierarchy or authority, nor did his attitude toward established churches become more friendly.[100]

For the Saint-Simonians, history was the progressive attainment of a universal, all-embracing church society. On the contrary, in the best Enlightenment tradition, both of Heine's "Saint-Simonian" books, while avoiding a materialism which ignores beauty, saw the progressive triumph of reason and the emancipation of man from the traditional shackles of religion. Completely absent from these two books is the basic Saint-Simonian conception of the alternation of organic and critical periods and of the critical character of modern society in the Saint-Simonian sense. For the Saint-Simonians the Middle Ages represented an organic, hence basically a normative, period, marked by faith and devotion, by "legitimacy, sovereignty, and authority," a period which had failed because of the church's inability to absorb the feudal system. For Heine, it was a "Geisteskerker,"[101] a period of superstition[102] and sickness. The modern period, beginning with the Reformation, was

[96] IV, 164; cf. *Briefe*, I, 465 (Nov. 19, 1830).
[97] Butler, p. 166. Cf. *Briefe*, III, 170 (Apr. 15, 1849); III, 195 (Jan. 25, 1850).
[98] *Œuvres*, XLII, 321 ff.
[99] *Werke*, III, 508-509.
[100] IV, 221.
[101] V, 240.
[102] V, 332.

critical and unnormative for the Saint-Simonians, a period of diminished authority, of skepticism, and of individualism, an era which served the negative function of destroying an old order so as to pave the way for an even more comprehensive period than the Middle Ages. For Heine, the Reformation, the French Revolution, and German philosophy all were stepping stones toward intellectual freedom and the victory of sensualism. And, finally, Heine was unable to give up his activist faith in revolution as an instrument of social betterment.[103]

Despite the Saint-Simonian terminology, the basic religious concepts of *Die romantische Schule* and *Zur Geschichte der Religion und Philosophie in Deutschland* are essentially those of the *Reisebilder*. In a sense, Heine's view of Christianity had become less charitable, considering that he had once recognized the basically democratic and cosmopolitan note in the teachings of Jesus. Deism (theism) was a slave religion,[104] a faith of sickness and old age,[105] which philosophy had to destroy before political and social revolution was possible. Particularly in their Roman Catholic form, Christian principles were basically counter to human nature and, therefore, through their denial of the natural needs of man, gave rise to sin and hypocrisy.[106] Indeed, religion and hypocrisy were twin sisters difficult to distinguish.[107] Behind religion's otherworldliness and asceticism, Heine (as in the *Reisebilder*) saw primarily political motives. Through its doctrine of the "Verwerflichkeit aller irdischen Güter, von der auferlegten Hundedemut und Engelsgeduld," Christianity, particularly Catholicism, became the strongest support of despotism.[108] The established church and vested interests were closely allied. "Nicht nur die römischen, sondern auch die englischen, die preußischen, kurz alle privilegierten Priester haben sich verbündet mit Cäsar und Konsorten zur Unterdrückung der Völker."[109] Behind German romanticism's cult of the Middle Ages and of mediaeval Christianity stood a "propaganda of priests and nobles" allied in a conspiracy against Europe's political freedom.[110]

The Reformation, rather than marking the end of an organic period and having value only in its negative functions, as the Saint-Simonians believed, still marked for Heine (as in the *Reisebilder*) a great positive milestone in the progress of human freedom. A new age began when

[103] See Heine's prophecy of the German Revolution, *Werke*, IV, 293-296. For a discussion of the Saint-Simonian conception of revolution see Iggers, *The Cult of Authority*, pp. 96-102; for a comparison of Heine's and the Saint-Simonians' views on revolution see Lichtenberger, *op. cit.*, p. 269.

[104] *Werke*, IV, 224.

[105] IV, 288.

[106] V, 217.

[107] V, 269.

[108] V, 217.

[109] IV, 221.

[110] V, 240; cf. V, 133.

Luther, the "greatest German," proclaimed before the Diet that his teachings could only be refuted by the Bible or by reason.[111] The church which had formed the integrating element in the great hierarchy dissolved into religious democracies,[112] and freedom of thought and press was established.[113]

Finally, as against the Saint-Simonian belief that individual reasoning was a socially disruptive force and that social truths must be presented to the public in a dogmatic form, Heine affirms the role of reason and of individual inquiry as prime instruments of human progress. The great achievement of the Reformation was to make reason the ultimate judge in all religious matters.[114] Progress in the natural sciences then became possible.[115] A faith in progress followed, coupled with the economic belief that through technical development all men could live comfortably on this globe; the irrationality of the exploitation of man was recognized,[116] as well as the unnatural character of otherworldly religion.[117]

Enfantin, to whom Heine had dedicated *De l'Allemagne*[118] (the French edition of *Zur Geschichte der Religion und Philosophie in Deutschland*), immediately understood the deep divergence between Heine's views of history and religion and those of the Saint-Simonians. In a long letter from Egypt,[119] written at the deathbed of his "apostle" Hoart, Enfantin expressed his disappointment at Heine's "concessions to the critical spirit of his French and German readers"[120] and at his failure to understand the essentially political character of religion. According to Enfantin, *De l'Allemagne* has five main shortcomings:

(1) The book leaves a void by dealing exclusively with the history of abstract ideas. Therefore, it is a "work of critical philosophy" rather than an attempt to deal with living politics, i.e., religion,[121] and it should be supplemented by an analysis of the "political, moral, artistic, and industrial situation" in Germany, by a study of the impact of ideas on the masses and its consequences for the future.[122]

(2) Heine views pantheism in Spinozan, "theoretical" terms, rather than in social, political terms. Spinozan pantheism, "philosophic" and

111 IV, 192.
112 *Ibid.*
113 IV, 194-195; cf. 287-288.
114 IV, 194.
115 *Ibid.*
116 V, 328.
117 V, 261.
118 For the dedication, see IV, 568.
119 *Œuvres*, X, 108-136 (Oct. 11, 1835).
120 X, 130.
121 X, 109.
122 X, 110-111.

"confused," unlike the Saint-Simonians' "ordered pantheism," found its political expression in the French Revolution with its contrast of liberal and philanthropic professions and the realities of terrorism and war.[123] In this contradiction between theory and practice, Enfantin sees the proof of the imperfect character of the

> Panthéisme éminemment théorique, éminemment philosophique et nonreligieux de Spinosa; imperfection qui consiste dans le peu de place qu'y occupe, si même il s'y trouve, le sentiment de *hiérarchie*, l'appréciation des *différences*, la distinction du *bien* et du *mal*, imperfection qui le rend impropre à la pratique, à la politique, parce qu'il n'implique pas autant l'idée d'*ordre* que celle de la *liberté*, parce qu'il n'engendre directement que celle d'*égalité*, les différences devenant des infiniment négligeables.[124]

(3) Heine should (and here the basic conflict in political views between Heine and Enfantin becomes clearest) re-evaluate the role of Austria in German affairs.[125] Rather than being condemned as the center of reaction, Austria should be viewed as a bastion of order and authority amidst the turmoil of a revolutionary world. To Austria belonged the "priestly" role of leadership in Germany "précisément parce qu'elle a résisté à l'envahissement des idées révolutionnaires, dont les autres États allemands sans elle, seraient enivrés."[126]

> L'Autriche est dépositaire de l'ordre, de la hiérarchie, du sentiment du devoir, et surtout de celui de la paix, elle n'a besoin que de les transformer, tandis qu'en Prusse et sur le Rhin il faut les faire renaître... Si nous reconnaissons que le dogme de la liberté et de l'égalité est incomplet, imparfait pour diriger les peuples, bénissons donc l'Autriche d'avoir résisté comme elle l'a fait à l'envahissement de ces idées purement révolutionnaires, et de les avoir repoussées même dans un Joseph II... bénissons l'Autriche de ce qu'elle donne un noble asile aux derniers représentants du droit féodal, à nos vieux Bourbons, car Dieu n'a pas dit encore son dernier mot sur la transformation par laquelle l'humanité annule un vieux *droit* et lui en substitue un nouveau...[127]

A deep kinship binds Austria (the soul of the German Prussian-Austrian-Rhenish trinity) and France (the soul of the Franco-Anglo-German trinity), both deeply conservative nations, both unable to become Protestant or adopt a constitutional régime for long.[128]

---

123 X, 114.
124 X, 114-115.
125 Enfantin's view of Austria's role of leadership in Germany differs somewhat from that of the *Globe*, which assigned such a role to autocratic Prussia and saw in Austria and Russia bridges between the advanced nations of the West and the backward Eastern European and Asiatic peoples. The *Globe* writer was careful to protect Austria against accusations of backwardness and feudalism, and sympathetically saw her as a well-governed country, little affected by revolution or German philosophic speculation, whose culture was characterized by a feeling of harmony. *Globe*, Apr. 3 and 4, 1832. See Iggers, *The Cult of Authority*, pp. 123-124.
126 *Œuvres*, X, 117.
127 X, 118-119.
128 X, 125.

(4) Heine has been unjust in his negative treatment of the positive religions. "Je n'ai pas plus que vous le désir de voir régner dans l'avenir la morale, la religion et la politique du passé," Enfantin notes, but "c'est un bon calcul de chercher à les convertir plutôt qu'à les écraser . . . "[129] Heine's ridicule of religion should be sharply condemned. The influence of religion in Germany must not be neutralized by "plaisanteries profanes"[130] but transformed. "L'homme qui met au pilori voltairien son semblable remplit les fonctions de bourreau, non d'enseigneur, de prêtre, de père de l'humanité."[131]

(5) Finally, Heine's conception of revolution should be rejected. The will of God expressed itself through priests and kings.[132] The revolution must come through guidance from above, not through bloody conflict.[133] Christianity would have failed without the support of princes.[134] "Prophète, relisez le nouveau christianisme de Saint-Simon,"[135] Enfantin admonishes in conclusion; in a postscript he expresses his greater satisfaction with the preface to the French edition of the *Reisebilder*.

Twelve days after Enfantin's reply, in a letter to Heinrich Laube, Heine repeated his views on the secondary role of political questions and his socio-ethical conception of religion.

> Ich sage das religiöse Prinzip und Moral, obgleich beides Speck und Schweinefleisch ist, eins und dasselbe. Die Moral ist nur eine in die Sitten übergegangene Religion (Sittlichkeit). Ist aber die Religion der Vergangenheit verfault, so wird auch die Moral stinkisch. Wir wollen eine gesunde Religion, damit die Sitten wieder gesunden, damit sie besser basirt werden als jetzt, wo sie nur Unglauben und abgestandene Heucheley zur Basis haben.

He mentioned that Enfantin had called him the "erste Kirchenvater der Deutschen."[136] After that, silence.

When Heine next wrote seriously about religion, he no longer used Saint-Simonian terminology. Yet it is doubtful whether a fundamental change had taken place in his religious and political views. Religiously, his basic purpose was still to reconcile spirit and matter, to cure the world of the "einseitigen Streben nach Vergeistigung, dem tollen

---

[129] "C'est beau comme de Maistre, comme Bonald, comme Chateaubriand et Lamartine; lorsque nous rêvons avec ces grands poètes, de même lorsque nous suivons le Danube, nous pauvres orphelins, qui n'avons plus de chefs, de Dieu, de Père."

[130] X, 128.

[131] X, 129.

[132] X, 133.

[133] X, 134; concerning the Saint-Simonian views of the basic role of the upper classes in revolutionary social transformation, see *Globe*, Nov. 29, 1831, and *Organisateur*, Aug. 15, 1830.

[134] *Œuvres*, X, 133.

[135] X, 135.

[136] *Briefe*, II, 103-104 (Nov. 23, 1835).

Irrtume, wodurch sowohl Seele wie Körper erkrankten."[137] The conflict of spiritualism and sensualism was replaced by the conflict of two types of personality: Nazarines (namely Jews and Christians, all those with "ascetischen, bildfeindlichen, vergeistigungssüchtigen Trieben") and Hellenes ("Menschen von lebensheiterem, entfaltungsstolzem und realistischem Wesen").[138] The final revelation had not yet come. "Sie beginnt mit der Erlösung vom Worte, macht dem Märtyrertum ein Ende und stiftet das Reich der ewigen Freude; das Millennium."[139] Politically, Heine's distrust of republicanism was combined with the realization of the betrayal of the democratic hopes of the July Revolution and with the condemnation of the rule of the privileged bourgeoisie.[140]

In the early 1840s, both *Atta Troll* and *Deutschland, ein Wintermärchen* reflect Heine's persistent faith in the allness of God,[141] and his essentially this-worldly conception of religion. The old "Entsagungslied, das Eiapopeia vom Himmel," composed by hypocrites for the purpose of enchaining the people, must give way to a new and better song of the kingdom of heaven on earth.[142] And here again the problems of religion are interwoven with the struggle not only against political but also against social privilege.

Heine's political and religious views in the 1840s still need careful study. The social concern found in elementary form in his pre-Saint-Simonian writings now assumed a central role in his political thought and his philosophy of history. From 1842 to 1844, a period when he came into close contact with the left Hegelians and radical social revolutionary German émigrés (a group with whom he had a much closer affinity, ideologically and temperamentally, than with the unwashed German republicans whom he had met on first coming to Paris), Heine began to see contemporary political realities more closely in terms of class interest and economic forces than he had in the *Französische Zustände*. The privileged position of the bourgeosie was no longer threatened primarily by republicans who saw in the July monarchy a denial of political democracy, but by the hungry, exploited masses. "Es handelt sich nicht mehr um Gleichheit der Rechte, sondern um Gleichheit des Genusses auf dieser Erde, und es gibt in Paris etwa 400,000 rohe Fäuste, welche nur des Losungswortes harren, und die Idee der absoluten Gleichheit zu verwirklichen . . ."[143] Around the corner was the almost inevitable communist revolution of the impoverished pro-

137 *Werke*, VII, 47.
138 VII, 24.
139 VII, 50.
140 VII, 65-66.
141 II, 371.
142 II, 431-432.
143 VI, 279.

letariat[144] which spelled the destruction of our cultural heritage.[145] Only "social ideas" and basic reforms could possibly still avoid catastrophe.[146]

The Saint-Simonians and the Fourierists, Heine held, did not yet fully understand the realities of the social situation and the virtual inevitability of the proletarian revolution. "Diese ehrenwerten Männer bewegt doch nur das Wort, die soziale Frage als Frage, der überlieferte Begriff, und sie werden nicht getrieben von dämonischer Notwendigkeit, sie sind nicht die prädestinierten Knechte, womit der höchste Weltwille seine ungeheuren Beschlüsse durchsetzt."[147] Sooner or later the scattered family of Saint-Simonians would have to join the "growing army of communism" and assume the role of leadership.[148] Yet even here, despite these predictions and his high respect for Karl Marx, who helped revise *Deutschland, ein Wintermärchen*, Heine was hardly a doctrinaire communist but a liberal, protesting against social injustice and class privilege, which he saw as the fundamental causes of revolution.[149]

After the 1848 Revolution, which Heine greeted with mixed emotions,[150] he expressed only minimal interest in political matters. He had become personally estranged from the Saint-Simonians, and, with his conversion to theism, had repudiated his old pantheistic beliefs which he claimed to have derived from Hegel.[151] Yet Heine himself questioned the depth of the change in his religious views.[152] Unable to understand how Saint-Simonian convictions were compatible with leadership in capitalistic enterprises, angered at being snubbed (and, as he admitted to Michel Chevalier,[153] by the Péreires' refusal of a loan), he repudiated his championship of the Saint-Simonians in the preface to the second edition of *De l'Allemagne* in 1855. When he had dedicated the first edition to Enfantin, the Saint-Simonians represented "le parti le plus avancé de l'émancipation humaine," persecuted by the police of the old society. By supporting them, he had shown his defiance for their opponents. Now, however, the martyrs of yesterday were respectable, bourgeois millionaires:

Ces ci-devant apôtres qui ont rêvé l'âge d'or pour toute l'humanité, se sont contentés de propager l'âge de l'argent, le règne de ce dieu argent, qui est le père et la

144 VI, 324-325, 279.
145 Cf. II, 273.
146 VI, 329; cf. II, 273.
147 VI, 409.
148 *Ibid.*
149 On Heine's relations with the radical left, see Ludwig Marcuse, "Heine and Marx: A History and a Legend," *GR*, XXX (1955), 110-124.
150 *Briefe*, III, 133 (Mar. 12, 1848).
151 III, 195. (Jan. 25, 1850); III, 170 (Aug. 15, 1849).
152 III, 194-195 (Jan. 25, 1850).
153 III, 599-600 (Feb. 25, 1855); cf. III, 618 (July 20, 1855); III, 652 (ca. Dec. 10, 1855).

mère de tous et de toutes—c'est peut-être le même dieu qu'on prêche en disant: Tout est en lui, rien n'est hors de lui, sans lui on n'est rien. Mais ce n'est pas le dieu qu'adore l'auteur de ces lignes, je lui préfère même ce pauvre Dieu nazaréen qui n'avait pas le sou, et qui était le Dieu des gueux et des souffrants.[154]

The influence of Saint-Simonian ideas on Heine's thought must not be overrated. His religious and political views before he came to Paris were surprisingly similar to those of his Saint-Simonian period. In Saint-Simonianism, he found concepts which helped him to express more clearly his own religious ideas. It is true that Heine's social views underwent a sharp change, from adherence to the revolutionary principles of 1789 and 1793 to an increasing realization of the importance of social and economic factors in politics. But this development was at least as much the result of his disillusionment with the July Revolution and the changing French political situation as of Saint-Simonian teachings. A son of the Enlightenment at heart, he could not accept the antilibertarian and antirationalistic core of Saint-Simonian social philosophy.

Dillard University

---

[154] *Werke*, IV, 569.

THE MADNESS OF HERCULES AND THE ELIZABETHANS

ROLF SOELLNER

FOR SCENES of highest passion, boundless anger or grief, akin to or allied with madness, the Elizabethan dramatists had a classical model in the *Hercules furens* of Seneca. Like other tragedies of the Roman philosopher, this play left its traces in theatrical convention, quotations, and verbal parallels of English Renaissance drama. However, in the matter of the madness of Hercules, the Elizabethans had more than one tradition to draw upon. It seems to have escaped notice that there existed a general *Hercules furens* convention which only partly derives from the Senecan play. In the present essay I shall describe the origin and the development of this convention, which is not exclusively literary but represents a curious mixture of myth, medical and philosophical theories, and stage practices, all blended according to Renaissance recipes.

The story of the madness of Hercules was told by the ancients in two versions. In the one, Hercules succumbed to madness before executing the twelve labors. Commanded by his father, Zeus, to obey Eurystheus, Hercules fell into despondency, loathing to serve a man whom he knew to be his inferior. While he was in this dejected mood, Hera, who had borne a grudge against him since his birth, afflicted him with madness. Mistaking his own children for enemies, he shot them down, and then attacked and slew his wife, Megara. When he recovered his senses, his contrition knew no bounds.[1] According to the other version of the story, Hercules' madness occurred after his return from Tartarus. During his absence cruel Lycus killed Creon, Megara's father, and usurped his throne. Just when Lycus was about to lay hands on Megara, Hercules reappeared and killed the usurper. At this moment angry Juno sent madness upon him and he attacked and slew his wife and children.[2]

Seneca, who followed Euripides, dramatized this second version. In characteristic fashion he intensified Euripides' rhetoric to the point of absurdity. But it should also be noticed that the representation of madness in the Senecan drama is more realistic than in Euripides. In Euripides, the conventional figure of Lyssa (Madness) appears on the stage and describes how she took possession of the hero, goaded him to

[1] Diodorus Siculus, *The Library of History*, IV, ii; Apollodorus, *The Library*, II, iv. The story is retold in the Renaissance collection of Natalis Comes, *Mythologiae* (Frankfurt, 1588), p. 683.

[2] Euripides, *Heracles*; Hyginus, *Fabulae*, 32. Retold by Comes, p. 683.

madness, and made him dance to her frenzied piping. In Seneca, the supernatural forces are kept in the background. Juno is the original author of Hercules' madness and vociferates her hatred of him in the prologue to the play; hers must be the frenzy first that is later to poison him. But the fit of insanity itself comes over the hero suddenly and without the intervention of a goddess, appearing as the result of his exertions and his excitement about the killing of his enemy Lycus as much as a divinely inflicted punishment. And with daring realism Seneca puts the raving hero on the stage while Euripides has other characters report Hercules' madness in his absence.

In Seneca, Hercules' frenzy breaks out immediately after his boastful prayer to Athena. In the midst of day he feels darkness coming over him (vs. 939). He imagines the constellations in rebellion and ready to attack him. With rolling eyes, he extolls his strength. In wild hyperboles he threatens to lead the Titans to war against the gods and to scale heaven by piling Ossa and Olympus on Pelion. Then a fatal delusion takes hold of him and makes him believe his own children are those of Lycus. Falling upon them, he kills one after the other. His wife, Megara, whom he mistakes for Juno, also falls under the shattering blow of his club. After the slaughter, physical weakness overcomes the hero. His eyes wander aimlessly, his vision grows dim, his hand trembles, his eyelids droop, and his neck sinks beneath his tired head. His legs refuse to support him, and, seemingly lifeless, he crashes to the ground like a tree or a rock. As he lies prostrate, evil dreams agitate him; he tosses his arms around as if angling for his club; he beats his chest and groans. Gradually his madness ebbs away and he sleeps quietly while the Chorus prays for his recovery. When he awakens, he is unaware of what he has done. When he recognizes the bodies, he declares himself a most miserable being, rages against himself, and threatens to take his own life. He is barely persuaded to refrain.

In this violent scene from Seneca's play the Elizabethans had a striking model for representing a sudden blinding passion as part of a revenge motif. Those who needed "English Seneca" could read the play in Jasper Heywood's very literal translation published in 1561 in octavo and included in *The Tenne Tragedies of Seneca,* which appeared in quarto in 1581.

Yet there was another incident in Hercules' life in which fury was said to have overcome him. And at least one Elizabethan writer seemed to think that Hercules derived the epithet *furens* from this incident. This was the dramatist Thomas Heywood, who recorded a very curious story about the histrionic exploits of Julius Caesar. Exemplifying the "ancient dignity of actors," Heywood had this to say:

> Julius Caesar for his ... pleasure became an Actor, being in shape, state, voyce,

iudgement, and all other occurrents, exterior, and interior excellent. Amongst many other parts acted by him in person, it is recorded of him, that with general applause in his owne Theater he played *Hercules Furens*, and amongst many other arguments for his compleatnesse, excellence, and extraordinary care in his action, it is thus reported of him. Being in the depth of a passion, one of his seruants (as his part then fell out) presenting *Lychas*, who before had from *Deianeira* brought him the poysoned shirt, dipt in the bloud of the Centaure *Nessus*: he in the middest of his torture and fury, finding this *Lychas* hid in a remote corner (appointed him to creep into of purpose) although he was, as our tragedians use, but seemingly to kill him by some false imagined wound, yet was Caesar so extremely carryed away with the violence of his practised fury, and by the perfect shape of the madnesse of *Hercules* to which he had fashioned all his native spirits, that he slew him dead at his foot, and after swoong him *terque quaterque* (as the Poet sayes) about his head.[3]

This anecdote is curious for several reasons. The scene which Caesar is supposed to have re-enacted is not the one dramatized by Euripides and Seneca, but rather the scene of Hercules' last tribulation in his death agony on Mount Oeta. The ancients did not designate these paroxysms of pain as fury. In Seneca's *Hercules Oetaeus* the hero expressly objects to the opinion of the bystanders that he has again succumbed to madness.[4] The episode, however, was familiar to the Elizabethans and Jacobeans more from Ovid's *Metamorphoses* than from Seneca's tragedy. Ovid describes Hercules with the shirt of Nessus upon him as raging and raving like a wild animal. In vain he tries to tear the shirt from his skin. His blood hisses and boils, dark perspiration pours from his whole frame, and pestilence melts his bones. He rages over Mount Oeta like a wild bull carrying a spear in his side. He brings trees crashing down and vents his wrath on the mountains. Catching sight of the messenger Lychas, who has brought the fatal shirt, Hercules shouts at him. As Lychas tries feebly to excuse himself, Hercules seizes him, swings him around *terque quaterque*—an Ovidian phrase that Heywood recalled—and flings him into the sea.[5] That Heywood should remember this episode is not surprising. He had put it into verse in his *Troia Britannica* (1602?), a poetic tale mainly based on Caxton's *Recueil of the Histories of Troy*. He also dramatized the incident in *The Brazen Age* (printed 1613) with much sound and fury.

The most curious feature of Heywood's anecdote is the attribution of acting to Julius Caesar. That the Roman general ever graced the stage is extremely unlikely, though some later emperors did indeed impersonate Hercules and with considerable violence.[6] Apart from giving

[3] Thomas Heywood, *An Apology for Actors* (1612), and I. G., *A Refutation of the Apology for Actors* (1615), ed. Richard Perkins (New York, 1941), sig. E3v.

[4] Line 823. Comes, p. 700, however, uses the term *furor*.

[5] *Metamorphoses*, IX.

[6] Suetonius, *The Lives of the Caesars*, "Nero," XXI, 3, LIII; Dio Cassius, *Roman History*, LIX, 26, LXXIII, 15, 20. See W. H. Roscher, *Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie* (Leipzig, 1886-90), I, ii, 2985.

the role to Julius Caesar, however, Heywood did not invent the account of the actor's "practiced fury" in the Hercules role. According to an anecdote, transmitted by Macrobius and well known in the Renaissance, the Greek actor Pylades was carried away far beyond the required make-believe when impersonating the ancient hero. Enraged by the audience's laughter at his antics, he doffed his mask and shouted at them: "You fools! Don't you see I act a madman's part."[7] Thus Heywood with his anecdote continued an ancient tradition about a furious stage Hercules. And, whatever we may think of the anecdote, the Elizabethans were hardly perturbed about its likelihood. In his answer to Heywood's *An Apology for Actors*, the straight-laced critic, I. G. [John Greene], never doubted the story about Julius Caesar and merely argued that "this example doth make against their Playes. For it's not unlikely but a Player might doe the like as often they have done."[8] Heywood's anecdote and I. G.'s reaction to it indicate that the Elizabethans associated frenzied acting with the Hercules role.

The summaries given above of Hercules' afflictions as described by Seneca and Ovid indicate the strong realism with which the ancients conceived these scenes; Hercules' affection had the form of an acute, fitful disease. In accord with this conception of the hero's state, there were those, beginning among the Greeks, who diagnosed Hercules' madness as a pathological phenomenon, in particular as an attack of melancholy, or an epileptic fit, or both. Among the ancients as well as among Renaissance writers, identification of certain states of melancholy with madness was common. Cicero found μελαγχολία so often associated with temporary insanity that he mistakenly believed the Greek term was equivalent to Latin *furor*.[9] Earlier, the Greek author of the *Problemata*, which were ascribed to Aristotle and under his name enjoyed much fame in the Renaissance, had specifically characterized Hercules as a melancholy hero, suffering from melancholic diseases. Since this writer looked upon melancholy as a sign of distinction, Hercules was in good company:

> Why is it that all men who are outstanding in philosophy, poetry, or the arts are melancholic, and some to such an extent that they are infected by the diseases arising from black bile, as the story of Heracles among the heroes tells? For Heracles seems to have been of this character, so that the ancients called the disease of epilepsy the "sacred disease" after him. This is proved by his frenzy towards his children and the eruption of sores which occurred before his disappearance on Mount Oeta; for this is a common affection among those who suffer from black bile.[10]

---

[7] Macrobius, *Saturnalia* II, vii, 16. Retold by Theodore Zwinger, *Theatrum Vitae Humanae* (Paris, 1572), lib. I, col. 127, and Erasmus, *Apothegmata* (Venice, 1577), p. 530.

[8] Heywood, p. 28.

[9] *Tusculan Disputations*, III, v, 11.

[10] *The Problems of Aristotle*, trans. W. S. Hett (London, 1927), p. 155. Prob-

The first English editor of Seneca's tragedies in the Renaissance, the grammar-school master and noted classical scholar, Thomas Farnaby, continued this tradition in his notes by characterizing the frenzy of Hercules as "wild delirium and melancholy": *θηριώδης παραφροσυνὴ* & *μελαγχολία*. Farnaby saw the reason for Hercules' sensation of darkness in excretions of black bile ascending from the stomach to the brain: "Veluti caligant oculi a sublato de ventriculo vapore. ita vbi halitus turbidi ab atra bile sursum feruntur concipiunturque in cerebri venis, imaginatio laeditur, vnde falso iudicant sensationes." Hercules must fall asleep and exhale the dark and bitter humor before his frenzy can ebb away completely: "Ita quamuis Herculis *μελαγχολικὸν πάθος* somno mulceatur ac sedetur non tamen plane atrum atque acrem humorem exspiravit."[11]

Farnaby's medical explanation of Hercules' frenzy would hardly have seemed odd in the Renaissance. Melancholy was considered such a common affliction that its occurrence in a classical hero was no surprise. In its grave form it was thought to be closely related to madness and sometimes identified with it. One wonders what Seneca might have thought about this physiological explanation. At any rate, Farnaby's diagnosis agrees with Seneca's tendency to make Hercules' frenzy a natural rather than a supernatural phenomenon. He explains the hero's affliction as a passion rather than a divine punishment, since melancholy —physiologically speaking, a thick fluid—was, psychologically speaking, a state of mind which could be accounted for by anger and excitement.

But the Greek author of the *Problemata*, who was the main propagator if not the inventor of the idea that Hercules suffered from melancholy, had also asserted that the hero was subject to two specific melancholic diseases, epilepsy during the slaying of his family and burning sores while on Mount Oeta. That melancholy, epilepsy, and madness should be linked can be accounted for by opinions held by the ancients and transmitted to the Renaissance. In medical theory, epilepsy was often thought to be caused by melancholy.[12] And in popular consciousness, at least, epilepsy and madness were both looked upon with superstitious awe and believed to be closely related. Epilepsy as well as madness was divinely produced, sacred or cursed. Euripides may have been under the sway of this popular belief when he described Hercules'

lem XXX, 953 a. At least one ancient story teller, Nicolaus Damascenus, also suggests an inflamed bile as a possible cause of Hercules' fury. See *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, ed. Karl and Theodor Müller (Paris, 1841-70), III, 369.

[11] Seneca, *Tragoediae* (London, 1613), pp. 24-39.

[12] Galen, *De Locis Affectis*, III, ix; Sir Thomas Elyot, *The Castel of Helth* (London, 1541), fol. 83^{r}; Laurentius, *A Discourse of the Preservation of Sight*, trans. Richard Surphlet (London, 1599), p. 88. See Lawrence Babb, *The Elizabethan Malady* (East Lansing, Mich., 1951), pp. 7, 36.

physical affections as something like an epileptic fit. He depicted the hero as rolling his eyes, panting, foaming at the mouth, undergoing convulsions, and fainting. And Seneca here followed Euripides rather closely. Neither Seneca nor Euripides, it is true, labeled Hercules' madness as epilepsy; but other ancient writers did. It was so widely believed that Hercules suffered from epilepsy that Ἡράκλειος νόσος and *Herculanus* or *Herculeus morbus* became eponyms for the disease.[13]

The proverbial *Herculanus morbus* did not escape the scrutiny of the greatest of the Renaissance collectors of proverbs, Erasmus, who accepted the term in his *Adagia* with some astonishment that it should be considered a proverb. He added an explanatory essay, a credit to his scholarship, in which he gave a human as well as a divine reason for the hero's affliction, the strain of the twelve labors and the threats of Juno.[14] "Herculean disease," a term hardly known to classical scholars today, was regularly listed in Renaissance Latin dictionaries and explained in in standard reference works.[15]

The Neoplatonists of the Renaissance gave a new twist to the idea of the epilepsy of Hercules by explaining it as something of a spiritual achievement. They fused a popular mediaeval superstition about the prophetic gift of epileptics with the pseudo-Aristotelian theory of the excellence of epileptic melancholiacs as exemplified by Hercules. Thus Marsilio Ficino and Agrippa of Nettesheim adduced Hercules and "many Arabs" as examples of rapturous prophetic epilepsy.[16]

One is led to the conclusion that the tradition of the mad Hercules as it evolved from the ancients to the Renaissance is a peculiar compound. While Seneca's *Hercules furens* was its center, various theories and explanations arose, partly around it, partly independent of it, strangely blending literary, medical, philosophical, and popular ideas. Increasingly Hercules' lapse into unconsciousness was explained in

[13] See Hippocrates, *De Morbis Mulierum*, lib. I. The term is regularly listed in proverb anthologies, which gave Hercules' exertions as the reason for his epileptic fit. See Dicaearchus, quoted by Zenobius, IV, 26; Diogenianus, V, 8; Apostolius, VIII, 64; Pseudo-Plutarch, *Proverbia Alexandrinorum*, 36. See Dicaearchus in E. L. Leutsch and F. G. Schneidewin, *Paroemiographi Graeci* (Göttingen, 1893), p. 91, where parallels are listed.

[14] *Adagiorum Chiliades Quatuor* (Cologne, 1612), fol. 511.

[15] Calepinus, *Dictionarium* (Leyden, 1553); Cooper, *Thesaurus* (London, 1563); Thomas Thomas, *Dictionarium* (Canterbury, 1596); John Withals, *A Dictionarie of English & Latin for Children & Young Beginners* (London, 1584); Petrus Crinitus, *De Honesta Disciplina* (Leyden, 1561), pp. 583-584, lib. XXX, cap. 1; Theodore Zwinger, *Theatrum Vitae Humanae* (Paris, 1574), lib. XVIII, cols. 701, 709; Bartholomaeus Anglicus, *De Proprietatibus Rerum*, trans. Stephen Batman (London, 1582), fol. 50^{r}.

[16] Marsilio Ficino, *Theologia Platonica de immortalitate animorum* (Paris, 1599), sig. E.e^{v}, lib. XIII, cap. 2; Agrippa of Nettesheim, *De Occulta Philosophia siue de Magia* (Cologne, 1533), p. 317, lib. III, cap. 50. Cf. also Campanella, *Civitas Solis* (pr. 1613) in *Ideal Empires and Republics*, ed. Charles M. Andres (New York, 1901), p. 307.

human terms and natural reasons took the place of supernatural causes for the hero's frenzy. Medical writers used his name to describe diseases but could not quite agree on a diagnosis, since madness, melancholy, epilepsy, prophecy, and ecstasy were associated in their minds to the point of confusion.

The supernatural element in Hercules' sudden fury, excluded or disregarded by the physicians, made its re-entrance through the Neoplatonic door. In Ficino and Agrippa the supernatural was no longer personified in the figure of a revengeful goddess but appeared dimly as the shadow of the unknown in an awe-inspiring mysterious disease. The reinterpretation of the mythological incident by these new mystics amounted to a transformation of the symbolic value of the Hercules figure. The ancient hero, the prototype of energy, moral strength, and rational control, became the symbol of ecstasy and enthusiasm. From here it was only a small step to associate him with the theory of prophetic inspiration and divine creation by artists and poets, a theory widely current in the Renaissance. The author of the academic Elizabethan comedy, *The Return from Parnassus* (pr. 1606), took this step when he ridiculed the prolific Nashe because of his "pen possest with Hercules furies."[17]

When considering the influence of the *Hercules furens* tradition on Elizabethan and Jacobean drama, one should consequently not restrict oneself to an examination of echoes from Seneca's play. The dramatists and the more discerning audience knew more about the outbreak of madness in the ancient hero than appears to a modern reader of the *Hercules furens*. Theories about the causes and form of Hercules' madness were in the air. As the dramatists wrote about heroes other than Hercules, they were likely to adapt whatever they knew of his passion-induced madness to their own purposes. And, since they were no meticulous antiquaries, they would also use whatever else they knew of passion, madness, and epilepsy.

Undoubtedly the *Hercules furens* convention provided a general stimulus for the device of temporary madness in Elizabethan and Jacobean tragedy. Usually this madness overcomes the hero during a revenge action, just as it had overcome Hercules. But here the similarity usually ends. Unless the writer refers directly to Hercules or uses several distinct features of the tradition, we cannot claim that the raging hero hovered in his imagination. On these grounds we must exclude from consideration some very famous examples of temporary madness on the Elizabethan stage, such as Kyd's Hieronimo and Shakespeare's Lear. Their resemblance to Hercules does not go much beyond the simple fact that they become temporarily insane.

[17] Tudor Facsimile Texts, ed. John S. Farmer (1912), sig. B3ʳ.

Apart from Heywood's literal dramatization of the Hercules myth in *The Silver Age* and *The Brazen Age*, there are four serious plays by Shakespeare's contemporaries and near contemporaries in which the *Hercules furens* tradition seems to me to be definitely part of the dramatic pattern. These are the anonymous *The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune* (pr. 1589), Robert Greene's *Orlando Furioso* (pr. 1594), and two tragedies by John Marston, *Antonio and Mellida* and *Antonio's Revenge* (pr. 1602).[18]

The Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune is the first extant Elizabethan play to contain a character who becomes temporarily insane. It seems to have escaped notice that this same character, Bomelio, is also the first melancholic person on the Elizabethan stage. A victim of the goddess Fortuna, through whose persecutions he is exposed to the indignity of exile, he shows clearly the symptoms of melancholy. At the beginning of the third act when he appears for the first time, "solus like an hermit," he soliloquizes at length on his misfortune. He has lost all hope, is overwhelmed with grief, delights in sighing, and, walking distractedly around, drives away "the weary time with his lamenting moan." Now in his advanced age he is reduced to "sing of his annoy" with "broken sighs in doleful tunes." Wretch that he is, he walks "the path of plaint" and "feeds upon woe." His "dainty dish shall be of fretting melancholy" served with the "savory sauce of broken sobs with hollow sighs." He seeks consolation for his grief in his magic books. When his well-meaning but ill-advised son burns these books, his tortured mind gives out altogether and he begins to rave. He feels as if night breaks upon him:

> Soul! give me my books. Let's have no more tarrying: the day begins to dark; it rains; it begins with tempests. Thunder and lightening! Fire and brimstone! And all my books are gone, and I cannot help myself, nor my friends. What a pestilence![19]

For several scenes, Bomelio raves in this fashion, mouthing extravagant complaints and violent curses. He is finally cured by a deep sleep into which he falls at the sound of music.

Bomelio can hardly be called a Herculean character in the usual sense of the word. Nevertheless his madness, with which we are concerned here, is in the *Hercules furens* tradition. It resembles that of Hercules in several important details. It has a divine as well as a human cause, since it is brought about by the machinations of a goddess, Fortuna, but is conditioned by Bomelio's abnormal, melancholy frame of mind. It sets in suddenly and with the sensation of darkness, like that

[18] This influence except for Marston has been suggested by Wilhelm Berghäuser, *Die Darstellung des Wahnsinns im englischen Drama bis zum Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Mainz, 1914).

[19] *Old English Plays*, ed. Dodsly-Hazlitt (London, 1874), VI, 175.

of Hercules. The cure is effected by a palliative sleep. Together these traits indicate with a fair amount of probability that the author of *The Rare Triumphs*, who had his share of classical learning, remembered the madness of Hercules from Seneca. He did not, however, indulge in specifically Senecan hyperboles. And he heightened the realism of the scene by putting Bomelio's ravings in prose. He may well have been responsible for the practice of using prose in the speeches of heroes whose minds are partially or completely deranged, a practice followed by later dramatists, Shakespeare among them.

The madness of the hero of Greene's *Orlando Furioso* takes a more rhetorical turn than that of Bomelio. His hyperbolic ranting contrasts with the madness of his prototype, the Orlando of Ariosto's epic, from which Greene's play is loosely derived. In the Italian poem, Orlando's insanity is less of words than of actions—superhuman, cruel, and violent. Only in their occasion do the two cases of love madness resemble each other. In both Ariosto and Greene, Orlando becomes wildly jealous when he reads the name of his paramour Angelica linked with that of Medor in the carvings and poems hung up by his enemy, Sacripant. But Greene's Orlando reacts mainly in a rhetorical fashion, in a classical and particularly Senecan vein (II, i). He feels "the flames of Aetna" rise in his breast. He calls Medor's servant, who has been planted at his side, "a messenger of Ate." He bids him speak lest he send him to "Charon's charge." While he listens to the slanderous accusations against Angelica, he gathers strength by invoking the Arcadian nymphs and the nieces of Titan. His verbal fireworks culminate in an imprecation against all womankind, introduced by a Latin quotation from Mantuan: "Foemineum sevile genus, crudele, superbum."[20] His misogynic excursus is also buttressed by two Italian quotations from Ariosto, which in their original setting have nothing to do with Orlando's madness but reflect the popular belief that madmen during their ravings have the supernatural gift of foreign tongues. Then a delusion takes hold of Orlando and he mistakes his servant for his enemy Medor. The astute servant succeeds in deviating Orlando's fury to the would-be shepherd and helper of Medor. Orlando attacks the scoundrel and drags him off stage by his leg. When he returns, the detached leg remains in his hand. He swings it around as if it were Hercules' club. In fact he fancies he is Hercules:

> Villaine, prouide me straight a Lion's skin
> Thou seest I now am mightie Hercules
> Look wheres my massie club upon my necke.[21]
> (II, i)

[20] *Eclogues*, IV, 110-111.

[21] Robert Greene, *The Plays and Poems*, ed. J. Churton Collins (Oxford, 1905), I, 243.

Afterward he is reported to run through the woods like "mad Orestes in his greatest rage." There is more of this classical madness, together with mistaking of identities, blustering, and beating. A second time Orlando imagines himself to be Hercules and sends his servant to Apollo for the shirt of Nessus (IV, ii). Finally his cure is effected by a magic fluid which makes him fall asleep. When he awakens he has forgotten what happened.

Orlando's madness resembles that of the Senecan Hercules in its sudden inception, the mistaking of identities, the violent attack on a person, the cure by sleep, and the complete unawareness of the frenzy after awakening. Orlando's hyperbolic rhetoric out-Senecas the furious Hercules with whom he twice identifies himself. Since Orlando's madness teems with unnatural rhetoric (the besetting sin of Seneca) and lacks psychological and physiological foundation (Seneca's modernity), it strikes one as rather primitive and lacking in realism. And of all the dramatists discussed here Greene owes least to the medical theories of the *Hercules furens* tradition.

Sometimes Greene's Orlando comes close to being comical. His bombastic speeches are not unlike the alliterative nonsense declaimed by Nick Bottom in "Ercles' vein, a tyrant's vein."[22] If Shakespeare thus shot a satirical arrow at Herculean oratory, a full satirical treatment of the Orlando-Hercules theme, which Greene's play invited, did not appear until James Shirley's *Love's Tricks or the School of Complement* (pr. 1631). In this play a blustering nitwit named Orlando Furioso promises to turn things upside down and to outlabor "Jove-born Hercules" (III, v). Another character in the same play, Infortunio, insane with jealousy, identifies himself with Hercules in Hades. Infortunio's ravings, illusions, and cure through sleep, though satirical in intention, correspond to the *Hercules furens* tradition.

The most extended satirical treatment of this tradition occurs in the academic play *Lingua* (pr. 1607).[23] The boisterous coward Tactus is clearly a take-off on the ranting, raving stage Hercules. He shows his true nature in V, v, when Lingua has gained the upper hand over Tactus and the other five senses by intoxicating them. The effect of alcohol on Tactus is much like that of jealousy on Orlando. Tactus becomes raving mad so that he "cannot otherwise be persuaded but he is *Hercules furens*." He wields a large blackjack and brags about his twelve labors. He threatens to attack Appetitus, who taunts him and promises to fling him into Hell. But when Appetitus pretends he hears Omphale, whom Hercules had served, enslaved by love, our Herculean Tactus cringes and fawns like a spaniel (V, vii). Subsequently he reappears with a robe

[22] *Midsummer Night's Dream*, I, ii, 42.

[23] Mentioned by J. W. Cunliffe, *The Influence of Seneca on Elizabethan Tragedy* (London, 1893), p. 18.

in his hand which he declares to be the shirt of Nessus. He raves and rants until Somnus binds him and his distemperature is remedied by sleep.

The main point of the satire is, of course, a comical revaluation of values. Tactus, who by virtue of his name and predilection for Hercules should be a strong and brave hero, is here a boastful coward. There also seems to be some burlesquing of technical aspects of the *Hercules furens* convention, for example when Tactus feigns that he is afflicted by melancholy (I, vii) and by the plague (I, viii). An academic audience would be likely to remember that these two diseases were attributed to Hercules during his madness and his death agony, respectively.

To take up John Marston's Antonio plays after a detour into this academic madness is to enter a different world. The atmosphere of *Antonio and Mellida* and *Antonio's Revenge* (or *The Second Part of Antonio and Mellida*) is somber, in the second play oppressively so. In Cunliffe's competent judgment, Marston owed more to Seneca than any other dramatist and most in the two tragedies under discussion.[24] But the Herculean features of Antonio in these two plays seem to have escaped attention. Through a major part of the action he is in an abnormal frame of mind. He has reason to be depressed. He is an exile, faced with the ruin of his family and with separation from his beloved Mellida. Later the duty to revenge his father's cruel murder falls on his shoulders. Such misfortune has made the sensitive Antonio a melancholic character whose emotional reactions are extremely violent. As his fortune changes, he rises from deep depression to sky-high elation, only to fall back into hopeless despair soon afterward. His behavior is so incongruous that even his friends call him "distraught," "accurst," and speaking with "madnesse breath."[25] Several times when his mind is strained to the breaking point, he succumbs to attacks of a pathological nature. He throws himself to the ground, groans, cries, wrings his hands, and strikes the earth with his fists. Once, when he collapses with a self-pitying complaint, a bystander opines: "Belike the falling sickness."[26]

This bundle of emotions is compared to Hercules. Antonio's friends draw the parallel: "Thou art another Hercules to us in ridding huge pollution from our State."[27] When Antonio in one of his fits of dejection revels hysterically in his grief, he imagines himself lying in a tomb with the inscription: *ne plus ultra*. Though the educated audience would hardly have missed the allusion to the famous inscription on the

[24] *Ibid.*, pp. 98-100.

[25] *The Plays of John Marston*, ed. H. Harvey Wood (Edinburgh, 1934), I, 27, 40, 95; Part I, Acts II, III; Part II, Act II.

[26] *Ibid.*, I, 27; Part I, Act II.

[27] *Ibid.*, I, 131; Part II, Act V.

pillars of Hercules, Antonio makes the comparison explicit: "let none out-woe me: mine's Herculean woe."[28] Marston apparently did not think that such odd behavior disagreed with Antonio's reputed prowess. He had Antonio in one of his collapses call himself "a poor, poor Orphant and a weake, weake childe" and "the Valiant'st creature that doth breath" in one and the same phrase.[29] But the traditional Hercules too had insisted that his sufferings transcended the patience of the strongest of men. The combination of strong physique and emotional explosion had its model in the figure of Hercules, with whom Antonio is compared and with whom he compares himself. Quite possibly Marston used "Herculean woe" in the sense of "morbus Herculanus" and as equivalent to "falling sickness."

Shakespeare too was fascinated by Hercules, as his many references to the hero show. But he knew how to avoid the absurdities which so easily mark the influence of the *Hercules furens* convention on Heywood, Greene, and Marston. In Shakespeare's plays the influence is rather elusive. But I believe its traces are discernible in *Hamlet, Antony and Cleopatra*, less obviously in *Othello*, and possibly in *Julius Caesar*.

Hamlet, contrary to Antonio, knows how little he resembles the sturdy Senecan hero. But at least once, carried away by excitement, he rivals Hercules in "a towering passion." This is in the graveyard scene, when he reacts violently to Laertes' protests of grief for Ophelia. Laertes, leaping into the open grave, asks to be buried with his sister:

> Now pile your dust upon the quick and dead
> Till of this flat a mountain you have made
> T'o'ertop old Pelion, or the skyish head
> Of blue Olympus.
>
> (V, i, 274-277)

In a fit of rage, Hamlet leaps after Laertes and grapples with him. He outboasts Laertes' grief by promising like Hercules to pile Pelion on Ossa:

> And if thou prate of mountains, let them throw
> Millions of acres on us, till our ground,
> Singeing his pate against the burning zone,
> Make Ossa like a wart! Nay, an thou'lt mouth,
> I'll rant as well as thou.
>
> (Lines 303-307)

In calmer mood, the Prince comments a little later:

> Let Hercules himself do what he may,
> The cat will mew, and dog will have his day.
>
> (Lines 314-315)

In this cryptic phrase, in which Hamlet seems to slip again into his

[28] *Ibid.*, I, 43; Part I, Act IV.
[29] *Ibid.*, I, 119; Part II, Act IV.

assumed madness, the "Hercules" is very likely aimed at the thrasonical Laertes.[30]

Of all Shakespeare's tragic heroes the one that most resembles Hercules is Mark Antony. A recent editor of the drama has noted that the Jacobean audience would not overlook the importance Antony attributes to his reputation as a soldier and a general, symbolized by his repeated affirmation of his descent from Hercules. On the stage this kinship would probably be made manifest by having Antony wear the lion's skin which had adorned his mythological ancestor.[31] But it is not only for military prowess that Antony chooses Hercules as his example. He also emulates his ancestor's passionate outbreaks. When in the battle of Actium he suspects Cleopatra of double-dealing, he lashes himself to violent fury by invoking Hercules:

> The shirt of Nessus is upon me: teach me,
> Alcides, thou mine ancestor, thy rage:
> Let me lodge Lychas on the horns o'th' moon,
> And with those hands that grasped the heaviest club
> Subdue my worthiest self.
>
> (IV, xii, 43-47)

Cleopatra afterward declares him to be "more mad than Telamon for his shield; the boar of Thessaly was never so embossed" (IV, viii, 1-3). Characteristically Antony sees himself here in the role of Hercules on Mount Oeta. For Shakespeare as for Heywood the Lychas episode seems to have marked the point of Hercules' highest fury.

Another battle-weary soldier in Shakespeare, Othello, suffers even greater emotional turmoil, climaxed by a complete physical and emotional collapse (IV, i). This is the scene, when "eaten up with passion" and fully convinced of Desdemona's unfaithfulness by the "ocular proof" of her lost handkerchief and Iago's insinuation that Cassio has confessed to have lain with her, Othello's mind disintegrates completely. The word "lie" turns in his mind like a dagger; he remembers the handkerchief; he trembles and shakes and sees nature's instruction in his passion. After a few disjointed sentences, he falls to the ground. Like the embodiment of evil, Iago triumphs over the fallen general: "Work on, my medicine, work!" When Cassio appears on the scene, Iago has an explanation for Othello's collapse, his "trance" as the stage directions in Quarto and Folio call it: "My lord is fall'n into an epilepsy. This is his second fit; he had one yesterday" (IV, i, 51-52). When Cassio suggests rubbing Othello's temples, Iago then fends him off. The "lethargy," he

[30] See John Dover Wilson's note in *Hamlet* (Cambridge, 1936), p. 241. Hercules was reputed to have disliked dogs and flies. The editors of *CL* drew my attention to this "Pelion-on-Ossa speech."

[31] John Dover Wilson, Introduction to *Antony and Cleopatra* (Cambridge, 1950), p. xxv.

says, should have its quiet course: "If not, he foams at mouth and by-and-by breaks out to savage madness" (lines 55-56). When Othello recovers consciousness, Iago explains that he has got rid of Cassio and "laid good 'scuse upon your extasy" (line 80).

Iago's explanation to Othello raises the question whether the Moor's breakdown was actually conceived by Shakespeare as an epileptic fit. Most editors have looked upon Othello's epilepsy as one of Iago's many lies.[32] But in general Shakespeare was fond of presenting heroes liable to abnormal and pathological states. There is a situation in *Macbeth* which parallels that of *Othello*. Lady Macbeth excuses the ghastly raptures of her husband during the banquet on account of his being "often thus" (III, iv, 61-62). Were it not for the fact that Macbeth earlier stood rapt at the appearance of the witches, one would probably assume she is lying in the banquet scene.[33] Iago's "good excuse" is probably only his request to Cassio to leave, lest his presence excite Othello. It seems highly likely that Shakespeare wanted his audience to believe that Othello suffered from the falling sickness, a disease which since the time of the ancients had afflicted some military heroes in states of high excitement. Othello's breakdown has indeed some features quite in keeping with the nature of an epileptic fit as well as with the *Hercules furens* convention. He shakes and trembles, senses darkness around him, and has the feeling that this all happens by divine instruction. If no convulsions are mentioned—neither are they in Seneca—these were not part of the "apoplectic" or, as we call them now, "dreamy states of epilepsy."

Another Shakespearean military hero suffering from epilepsy is Julius Caesar. In describing Caesar's epileptic fit, Shakespeare deviated somewhat from his sources. Though Plutarch and other historians recorded Caesar's spells, there is no report that he suffered from an attack during the feast of the Lupercalia as he does in Shakespeare's play. Two different reasons have been given in explanation for this deviation. According to one, Shakespeare wanted to represent Caesar in the grip of great excitement, according to the other, he wanted to show the hand of fate upon him.[34] These two explanations do not cancel each other out, but rather complement each other as aspects of *morbus Herculanus* as understood by the Elizabethans. So elementary a book as Withals' *Little Dictionary*, which was probably William Shake-

[32] There are exceptions: Charles Knight (Edinburgh, 1878), VIII, 204; Henry Hudson (Boston, 1900), XVIII, 256. See Robert Lawson, "The Epilepsy of Othello," *Journal of Mental Science*, XXVI, (1880), 1-11.

[33] Lily B. Campbell, *Shakespeare's Tragic Heroes Slaves of Passion* (Cambridge, 1930), p. 168.

[34] Robert Lawson, "The Epilepsy of Othello" and C. Alphonso Smith, "The Dramatic Import of the Falling Sickness in Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*," *Poet Lore*, VI (1894), 469 f.

speare's Latin vocabulary book, gives the essential information on this point under "morbus Herculeus." The Elizabethans would think of epilepsy as a likely sequence to an intense emotional state, the state in which it overcame Hercules. In the case of Caesar, the epileptic attack can be accounted for by his disappointment at the applause with which the populace greeted his refusal of the crown and thus blighted his secret ambition. But Shakespeare's audience was also likely to have looked upon epilepsy as a disease of prophetic power, as *morbus sacer* or *morbus comitialis*, the latter term deriving from the fact that at the occurrence of an ill-boding epileptic fit the Roman Comitiae closed their doors. Caesar's epilepsy then, with its "divine instruction," would probably have been felt as one of those "portentous things" that point with fatal finger to the Ides of March and his murder.

The relating of Caesar's as well as Othello's epilepsy with the *Hercules furens* convention depends on Shakespeare's knowledge of the "Herculean disease," which cannot be proved. But there is no doubt that epilepsy had a dramatic significance to Shakespeare and the Elizabethans which we as children of an age more rational in medical matters accept no longer. And circumstantial evidence, at least, indicates that the *Hercules furens* convention sanctioned this dramatic exploitation of epilepsy.

We have seen how the ancients originated and transmitted ideas about the madness of Hercules and how Renaissance writers added to these ideas. The Elizabethans could and did use the figure of Hercules in a manner somewhat at variance from the orthodox classical interpretation. For the playwrights Hercules became sometimes what Herod had been for the writers of mediaeval mystery plays, the prototype of the passionate stage character. They invoked him in outbreaks of a towering passion. A strange role for the imperturbable hero and patron saint of the Stoics! In portraying the Senecan image of this giant some Elizabethans tore passions to tatters to the point of absurdity and provided targets for the satirists' arrows. Other dramatists strove to be realistic and made use of medical theories that had been part of the Hercules myth since the ancients. Shakespeare too seems to have been influenced by this medical side of the *Hercules furens* convention. But, as so often when one compares Shakespeare's use of a convention with that of his contemporaries, one is struck by the way it is made subservient to the creation of memorable and credible characters—always the first business of the good dramatist. In fact, if it were not for the occurrence of similar features among Shakespeare's contemporaries, one might think that Shakespeare, as has sometimes been asserted, followed nature exclusively and did not create within the framework of dramatic customs of his time. To a large extent this impression is due to the fact that Shakespeare's never allows conventions to efface the main outlines of

his heroes. In spite of their temporary subjection to passion, they remain heroes and do not become eccentric Bomelios, raging Orlandos, or lachrymose Antonios. Othello's breakdown makes visible the temporary subjection of a noble mind. Antony's outbreak accentuates his physical vigor and his impulsiveness. While Caesar's epilepsy may detract somewhat from our historical image of the energetic dictator, Renaissance views of this infirmity give it a dramatic impact and make it appear part of the fate which Caesar represents. Though Shakespeare's heroes are human and have human flaws, their dignity compares well with that of the original Hercules.

Illinois Wesleyan University

THE MODERN HERO: PHOENIX OR ASHES?

EDITH KERN

CRITICS of the novel have in recent years looked with misgivings at the literary hero. He has been found wanting, disintegrating, "demolished" ever since the seventeenth century, "unheroic" in the nineteenth century, and "vanishing" in the contemporary novel. Consistent though each commentator seems to be in presenting his own thesis, the picture that emerges is one of confusion and contradiction. This is due, I believe, to a misconception of the role played by the seventeenth-century literary hero, to a certain semantic ambiguity inherent in the word "hero," and to the failure to reappraise philosophically the concept of the hero transmitted to us from the Renaissance.

In his work on the novel in France, which deals in particular with Constant, Balzac, Flaubert, and Proust, Martin Turnell outlines the literary hero's decline and deplores the ultimate dissolution in a commercial society of that ideal of the Renaissance humanists which found its richest expression in Corneille's tragedies.[1] His observations echo those of Paul Bénichou, who held in his *Morales du Grand Siècle*[2] *that* the "demolition of the hero" came about after the Fronde—coinciding with the general decay of French aristocracy. However, the Cornelian hero had already been dealt a fatal blow by Jansenist philosophy. As Bénichou pointed out, the Jansenists and in particular Pascal undermined the seventeenth century's conception of *gloire*, presenting it as an expression of man's vanity and presumption rather than his nobility and unselfishness.

A position rather similar to that of Turnell is taken by Raymond Giraud in *The Unheroic Hero*.[3] But this critic accuses neither the Fronde nor Jansenist philosophy, but holds the French Revolution responsible for the nineteenth-century hero's lack of heroism. Although Giraud does not define the word "hero," maintaining that it would lose all meaning if defined absolutely and that "every man is entitled to his own conception as to what a hero should be," he takes as his point of departure a declaration of Heinrich Heine. Like Stendhal, Balzac, and Flaubert, the German poet found the nineteenth-century French hero, by necessity, a representative of the French bourgeoisie and hence incapable of true heroism:

> The tragic poet needs to believe in heroism but that is entirely impossible in a country dominated by a free press, representative government and the bourgeoisie

[1] Martin Turnell, *The Novel in France* (New York, 1951), pp. 3-5.
[2] Paris, 1948.
[3] New Brunswick, N. J., 1957.

> . . . The diminution of all greatness, the radical annihilation of all heroism, these things are above all the work of that bourgeoisie that came into power in France through the fall of the aristocracy of birth. In all spheres of life that bourgeoisie has caused its narrow and cold shopkeeper's ideas to triumph. It will not be long before every heroic sentiment and idea will get to be ridiculous in France, if indeed they do not perish completely.[4]

Heine's complaint was given even more poignant expression by the brothers Goncourt in their journal: "Everything goes to the people and deserts the kings. Even literature descends from royal misfortunes. From Priam to Birotteau!" Retail perfumers are assigned places in literature which were formerly the prerogatives of kings. Indeed, money itself—for Grandet is but an anagram of *d'argent*—becomes the hero of novels.

Harry Levin's investigation of the novelistic hero leads him to elaborate a theory already implicit in an observation of the Goncourt brothers—the hero changes in accordance with a changing society. The protagonist of the nineteenth-century novel—especially that of the Victorian era—is, Levin maintains, a hero in only a purely technical sense. His "bourgeois environment affords little scope for exploits and passions on the epic or romantic scale."[5] He is caught instead in the web of marriage and money. But, in Levin's view, it was not only the bourgeois environment and mentality that deprived the nineteenth-century protagonist of heroic grandeur; Darwinism dealt the hero another blow, for "no man is a hero to the naturalist."[6] Consequently, the nineteenth-century writers, although perhaps more hero-conscious than any of their predecessors because of the one real hero which their century had produced, clamored in vain for a hero on the Napoleonic scale. Yet the century had, after all, condemned Napoleon; and his imitators, whether literary or real, could exist only as rebels against society, as outcasts of some sort—perhaps as artists or criminals. It must not be forgotten that even Napoleon considered himself a product of his country's earlier heroic literature, with which he surrounded himself during his campaigns, and that he once remarked that "France owed part of its heroic deeds to Corneille."[6]

If the nineteenth-century hero is judged so severely, his successor is given even harsher treatment by the critics. Wallace Fowlie, comparing Swann and Hamlet, considers Swann the prototype of the "modern hero of inaction," "a contemplator of infecundity," not living "in alliance with his destiny" but in the midst of the "dissolution of all his moral prejudices."[7] Sean O'Faolain expresses deep concern about the fate of

[4] Quoted by Giraud, *op. cit.*, p. 48.

[5] Harry Levin, "Society as its own Historian," in *Contexts of Criticism* (Cambridge, Mass., 1957), pp. 171-189. See also "From Priam to Birotteau," *Yale French Studies*, VI (1950), 75-82.

[6] "From Priam to Birotteau," *loc. cit.*, p. 77.

[7] "Swann and Hamlet: A Note on the Contemporary Hero," *Partisan Review*, IX (1942), 195-202.

the literary hero in a society where most of the "traditional certainties have become progressively less and less certain."[8] Like Taine and Levin, O'Faolain thinks of the hero as a "social creation" who personifies the "socially approved norm . . . to the satisfaction of society," which in turn decorates him with a title—or, as Taine had put it, "the model that contemporaries invest with their admiration and sympathy."[8] After examining the novels of Huxley, Waugh, Graham Greene, Faulkner, Hemingway, Elizabeth Bowen, Virginia Woolf, and James Joyce, the Irish critic comes to the conclusion that "the one constant in all the writers before me, is the virtual disappearance in fiction of that focal character of the classical novel, the conceptual hero."[9] For O'Faolain the classical novel is the nineteenth-century novel, whose hero has been found wanting by all the other critics thus far considered. Unwilling to decide whether Jansenism, the French Revolution, Darwin, or even Freud should be held responsible for the disappearance of the hero, he detects, nevertheless, strong neo-Pascalian trends in modern writing. He accuses such novelists as Bernanos, Julien Green, Mauriac, Céline, Marcel Aymé, Camus, Faulkner, Moravia, George Orwell, and Graham Greene of being as "anti-humanist, anti-heroic, highly sceptical about man's inherent dignity . . ." and "full of misgivings as to the nature of free-will" as the Jansenists.[10] Compared to the hero of the classical novel, the hero of these writers seems to O'Faolain an even "less neat and tidy concept, since he is always presented as groping, puzzled, cross, mocking, frustrated, and isolated, manfully [for we are assured that this hero may be very brave] or blunderingly trying to establish his own supra-social codes . . . He is sometimes intelligent in the manner of Julien Sorel or Stephen Dedalus. Whatever he is, weak or brave, brainy or bewildered, his one abiding characteristic is that, like his author-creator, he is never able to see any Pattern in life and rarely its Destination."[11]

How can we explain this unanimous condemnation by the critics, when they are at such variance with regard both to the reasons for the hero's vanishing or decay and to the historical moment that dates the beginning of his corruption? The answer is contained either explicitly or implicitly in each critic's argument—the Cornelian hero with his concepts of *gloire* and *vouloir* has remained the prototype of all heroism. Himself the personification of a Rennaissance ideal, he has set the standards for all subsequent heroes. Resurrected in the person of Napoleon, he haunted the nineteenth-century novelists, and his rigid specter still hovers over us, making modern heroes appear dwarfed and contorted.

[8] Sean O'Faolain, *The Vanishing Hero* (London, 1956), p. 16. See also Harry Levin, "From Priam to Birotteau," *loc. cit.*, p. 76.
[9] O'Faolain, *op. cit.*, p. 14 f.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 81.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 17.

Is it altogether justifiable to compare the principal character of modern novels with heroes of seventeenth-century tragedy? This is the comparison made by Fowlie, by Heine and all those who share his views, and also by Turnell and even O'Faolain when they adopt Bénichou's argument, which considers exclusively heroes of tragedy. Surely it would be a more rational and coherent procedure to group like with like and to compare the contemporary novelistic hero with his forerunner in the seventeenth-century novel. And, as good fortune has it, part of our work has already been done for us—and by none other than Boileau in his dialogue entitled *Les Héros de roman*.[12]

Boileau's spirited dialogue, written in the manner of Lucian, was not published until 1674, although written much earlier, allegedly between 1664 and 1665, and circulated among his friends. Its merits are not due to plot or character but rather to the devastating satire of Mlle. de Scudéry's and La Calprenède's "héros" who pass in mock parade before Pluton, ruler of the underworld. Pluton is in need of valiant men to defend him against a rebel force, and appeals for help to the heroes within his realm (p. 180). Diogène, his counselor, gives him to understand that "cette pestilente galanterie" has now infected even the infernal regions, with the result that the heroes and heroines dwelling there are "les plus sottes gens du monde, grâce à certains auteurs, qui leur ont appris, dit-on, ce beau langage, et qui en ont fait des amoureux transis." We encounter "le grand Cyrus" who has changed his name to Artamène, no longer the historical figure whose ambition it was to subjugate the universe but the tender admirer of a princess abducted no fewer than eight different times. Then there is Horatio Coclès. He is engaged in composing songs for his beloved Phénisse and elicits from Pluton the dismayed outcry "Hé! Horatio Coclès, vous qui étiez autrefois si déterminé soldat, et qui avez défendu vous seul un pont contre toute une armée, de quoi vous êtes-vous avisé de vous faire berger après votre mort? et qui est le fou ou la folle qui vous ont appris à chanter?" (p. 190). To Pluton's relief, Horatio Coclès is joined by Clélie who, according to Titus Livius, "passa le Tibre à la nage pour se dérober du camp de Porsenna" (p. 191). But it is soon clear that even she does not live up to her historical reputation, for she believes that the imminent battle threatens the "pays de galanterie," the "royaume de Tendre," and the "village de Petits Soins," as well as the rivers "Billets-Doux" and "Billets-Gallants," regions never mentioned by Ptolemy, as Pluton sarcastically remarks. Even Lucrèce, traditionally the most virtuous person in the world, makes her appearance as "galante" and proves her intellectual powers by speaking in "paroles transposées" (a device used by Mlle. de Scudéry in *Clélie*). Indeed, even the somber and forbidding

[12] Critical edition by Thomas Frederick Crane, New York, 1902. References are to pages in this edition.

Brutus turns out to be "un esprit naturellement tendre et passionné, qui fait de jolis vers, et les billets du monde les plus galants," and is challenged by Sappho to a discussion on the merits of friendship and definitions of "cœur tendre," "tendresse d'amitié," "tendresse d'amour," "tendresse d'inclination et tendresse de passion" (pp. 196-200). Sappho's exquisite talent of portraiture is exemplified, moreover, by her graceful picture of Tisiphone—"la plus effroyable des Euménides."

The greatest adventures of these "héros" involve, Boileau maintains, "un billet perdu ou un bracelet égaré"; and they are judged by Pluton to be mere phantoms, likenesses of inane contemporaries rather than of the heroes of antiquity whose names they had the audacity to adopt. The satire is concluded with their dismissal in disgrace and their sad appeal to the two writers who brought them into being. This seems to be the core of Boileau's criticism; for even in the "Discours," with which he prefaces his dialogue, he condemns in a more serious tone these authors who "des héros les plus considérables de l'histoire firent des bergers très frivoles, et quelquefois même des bourgeois encore plus frivoles que ces bergers" (p. 169). He criticizes in particular the characters in Mlle. de Scudéry's *Clélie*, veritable caricatures of heroes, antitheses of their historical prototypes who can only be referred to as "damerets héros de roman."

The seventeenth-century picture of the "héros de roman" makes it necessary, of course, to readjust any standards of heroic value arrived at by looking solely at the Cornelian hero. Quite contrary to the critical comments quoted earlier, there is no decline of the *novelistic* hero since the seventeenth century—he was found wanting by his own contemporaries. Nor can the state of the hero in today's novel be rightly considered a result of the influence of the Fronde with its subsequent collapse of French aristocracy or of any philosophical undermining of the concepts of *gloire* and *vouloir* by the Jansenists. Boileau's criticism changes the entire perspective; we can now see the hero's rise rather than his fall since the seventeenth century. Novelistic heroes of later periods have certainly gained in strength as well as interest, and the twentieth-century hero in particular has expanded and deepened his world considerably as compared to the "damerets héros de roman" described by Boileau.

O'Faolain and others might argue, of course, that the modern hero in literature is the successor of French tragedy rather than of the French *roman*. Strong evidence of a break in the prose tradition of the seventeenth century may be seen in the English differentiation between the word "romance," as designating the genre represented by the *romans* of Scudéry and La Calprenède, and the word "novel," referring to a genre in accordance with our modern conception of the word. But

one cannot overlook the fact that the French word *roman* has maintained itself through the centuries, and that the novel's development in France, from D'Urfé to Proust, Malraux, or Beckett, has been felt as an evolution rather than a revolution—which would have necessitated new names for suddenly emerging new genres. Such a continuity is also apparent in the fact that love still represents the most important subject of the novel and has lost its significance only in some of the most recent works. There can be no doubt that this is a direct legacy from the early seventeenth-century novels in France. Huet, glancing back in 1666 at what had been achieved in the field of the *romans*, defines them as "des histoires feintes d'aventures amoureuses, escrites en prose . . . " and explains, "J'ajouste, d'aventures amoureuses parce que l'amour doit estre le principal sujet du Roman . . . "[13]

In taking the principal characters of her *romans* from history, Scudéry simply adhered to the general principles of literary taste prevalent in France in the seventeenth century, principles either directly or indirectly inherited from the fourth-century grammarians and derived from Aristotle. In endowing her characters with a capacity and concern for love she merely expressed and promoted a tendency characteristic for France during the century. As historical and literary characters crossed the border into France, they became more amorous. This distinguishes even Corneille's Cid, in spite of his heroic grandeur, from his Spanish predecessor. Castro's Cid still appeared in the image of the traditional hero known to all epics and mythologies, a person chosen by God or gods to perform his difficult deeds—Corneille's Cid is a hero by sheer will power. He chooses to be a hero and also sets himself apart from the traditional heroes by choosing to love Çhimène—and his love is as important a part of his existence as his bravery. In Corneille's play, the Cid's heroic stature, in that Renaissance sense of the word which Bénichou, Turnell, and O'Faolain stress, is enhanced rather than diminished by this love.

It is interesting to notice the precise direction which Boileau's criticism of the "héros de roman" takes. He attacks Scudéry's and La Calprenède's novels for their lack of historical truth and what might be called local color. An appreciation of local color is hardly the distinguishing feature of the seventeenth century, when Roman emperors appeared on the stage attired in the same garb as their French audience and observing the *bienséances* devised by French society; but Boileau insists in his dialogue that historical truth should be observed and in his *Art Poétique* advises future authors to avoid the pitfalls of "héros de roman":

[13] Pierre-Daniel Huet, *Traité de l'origine des romans*, crit. ed. Arend Kok (Amsterdam, 1942), p. 114.

Conservez à chacun son propre caractère.
Des Siècles, des Païs, étudiez les mœurs.
Les climats font souvent les diverses humeurs.
Gardez donc de donner, ainsi que dans Clélie,
L'air ni l'esprit français à l'antique Italie,
Et sous des noms Romains faisant vostre portrait,
Peindre Caton galant et Brutus dameret.
(III, 112-116)[14]

Boileau does not suggest that authors paint the portraits of their contemporaries under their own names. The presence of historical heroes in the *romans* is not inappropriate. It is only the distortion of heroism and heroes that disturbs him. History and particularly Roman history provides the scale of heroism, as it provides the heroes.

There is, however, in Boileau's satire another element in addition to his concern for historical truth or color. It touches upon the meaning of the word "hero" and comes to light in the climax of the dialogue between Pluton and Diogène. Pluton's disparaging exclamation: "... et ce sont des héros?" is met by Diogène's reply: "Comment! si ce sont des héros? Ce sont eux qui ont toujours le haut bout dans les livres et qui battent infailliblement les autres." When Pluton persists in his inquiry: "Et tous ces héros-là ont-ils fait vœu de ne jamais s'entretenir que d'amour?" Diogène proffers the scathing reply: "Et de quel droit se diraient-ils héros, s'ils n'étaient point amoureux? N'est-ce pas l'amour qui fait aujourd'hui la vertu héroïque?" Even if spoken with the strongest accents of sarcasm, these statements reveal that love has become a new attribute of the hero and perhaps the most important one—and, above all, that heroes are no longer exclusively identified by their place in history but by the place they hold within a book: "Ce sont eux qui ont toujours le haut bout dans les livres." This must be considered a decisive development in the etymology of the word.

The word "hero" apparently came into usage, both in France and England, during the Renaissance, and was first employed in the sense in which it had been known or was thought to have been known to the Greeks and Romans. The *New English Dictionary* quotes from 1555, "Goddes made of men whom the antiquitie cauled heroes," and Huguet's *Dictionnaire de la langue française du seizième siècle* defines the word in this primary sense. During the latter part of the seventeenth century the word designated more broadly men of great achievement who could serve as examples. Even scientists and philosophers such as Descartes and Gassendi were referred to as heroes, as the *New English Dictionary* and Richelet's *Dictionnaire françois*, published in 1690, indicate. Bloch and von Wartburg, in their *Dictionnaire étymologique*, point out that it was during the seventeenth century that

[14] Huet, *op. cit.*, p. 67

the word came to designate the principal character in a literary work. And this is already attested in Richelet.

The semantic development of the word seems natural enough. Since the principal characters of most plays and *romans* and of all epics were heroes in the traditional sense of the word, or at least bore the names of heroes, it was natural to refer to them as the heroes of a certain play or *roman* and then of plays and *romans* in general. Furetière's *Roman bourgeois*, published in 1666, illustrates this transition quite convincingly. Parodying both the *romans* in vogue and the style of Virgil's *Aeneid*, Furetière prides himself on singing "les amours et les aventures de plusieurs bourgeois de Paris de l'un et de l'autre sexe" and on telling "sincèrement et avec fidélité plusieurs historiettes ou galanteries arrivées entre des personnes qui ne seront ni héros ni héroïnes, qui ne dresseront point d'armées, ni ne renverseront point de royaumes, mais qui seront de ces bonnes gens de médiocre condition . . ."[15] Here the primary meaning of the word is still prevalent; the "bonnes gens de médiocre condition" stand in fundamental contrast to the "héros" involved in the great struggles of history, and Furetière challenges the world by daring to sing of the loves and daily exploits of ordinary people.

But in the second part of the same *roman* the author pleads with his reader not to expect him to abide by the unity of time or place, "ni que je fasse voir un héros dominant dans toute la pièce."[16] It is immaterial to our discussion whether Furetière has in mind the three unities; what interests us is that *héros* is used here apparently in a way which leaves room for its transferred meaning. Huet's treatise, written a few years later, does not employ the word in this sense, but rather speaks of the principal characters of *romans* as *acteurs*.[17] The publication of Boileau's satire in 1674 would have been largely pointless, had the transferred meaning of the word been fully established at that time; yet both the dialogue and Furetière's *Roman* give evidence of shades of semantic changes within the word. Indeed, by their comic verve they may well have contributed to the ultimate change in its meaning which Richelet, by 1690, considers so much a *fait accompli* that he states in his *Dictionnaire*: "Le héros du *Roman comique* fut pendu à Pontoise."

A hero hanged? This paradox is worse than that of Tom Jones who, centuries later, made Thackeray write with tongue in cheek: "A hero with a flawed reputation, a hero sponging for a guinea, a hero who cannot pay his landlady and is obliged to let his honour out to hire, is absurd, and the claim of Tom Jones to heroic rank is quite untenable." Richelet's phrase shows a complete dissociation of the word from its

[15] Furetière, *Le Roman bourgeois*, ed. Classiques Larousse, 2nd ed., pp. 12-13.
[16] *Ibid.*, p. 69.
[17] Huet, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

original meaning. The hero of a book no longer has to be heroic. He may be, indeed, the very opposite. He owes his designation as hero solely to the fact that he is the book's leading character.

Yet the primary meaning of the word is seldom disregarded as completely as it is in Richelet's phrase. The Renaissance definition has rather, through the centuries, lent vague undertones and overtones to its transferred meaning. Trollope was fully aware of this impact when he complained, in 1866, "Perhaps no terms have been so injurious to the profession of the novelist as those two words hero and heroine. In spite of the latitude which is allowed to the writer in putting his own interpretation upon these words, something heroic is still expected; whereas if he attempt to paint from Nature how little that is heroic should he describe."[18] It is apparently the Renaissance definition of the word, to which critics have tacitly adhered, which affected the vision of Heine and his contemporaries and still influences commentators on the novelistic hero.

Perhaps we should drop altogether, for our modern times, the Renaissance meaning of the word hero. We have learned that the Greek hero is but another facet of that universal hero with a thousand faces, who is to be found not only in all mythologies and folktales but, symbolically, within the psyche of man himself. On reading Freud's *Moses and Monotheism* or Campbell's *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* or the works of Jung, one realizes that in its primary meaning the concept of the hero encompasses aspects totally ignored by the humanists of the Renaissance and their successors, but which are emerging anew in the heroes of modern literature whom O'Faolain finds so lacking in heroic qualities. "Freud, Jung, and their followers," as Campbell points out, "have demonstrated irrefutably that the logic, the heroes, and the deeds of myth survive in modern times. In the absence of an effective general mythology, each of us has his private, unrecognized, rudimentary, yet secretly potent pantheon of dreams."[19] In societies where mythology is alive and its archetypal images are understood, the hero undergoes symbolically the trials of life, death, transfiguration, and rebirth and relates them to his society as well as to the cosmos.

Some modern novelists have attempted to find again these archetypal images as well as the keys to these relationships.[20] Carried away perhaps by his own views on the decaying hero, O'Faolain criticizes the intellectual *jusqu'au-boutisme* of these authors, contrasting it with the attitude of those earlier writers who were content to bring their novels to an intermediate destination by limiting their themes to marriage, love, and domestic happiness. He accuses these modern novelists of

[18] *New English Dictionary.*
[19] Joseph Campbell, *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* (New York, 1949), p. 4.
[20] *Ibid.*, pp. 16-18.

disintegrating, liquefying, and possibly dehumanizing their characters, though he cannot withhold from them a certain admiration.[21] But it seems to me that these novelists deserve particular credit for attempting to find again those insights and values for which man has been groping throughout his existence, for which such themes as marriage, love, and domestic happiness have only ephemeral and ornamental interest. If this is true, the hero is not vanishing (as we have seen that he did not vanish in the seventeenth century). Rather, a Phoenix reborn, he errs as he always has on that ancient tortuous road—passing through dark forests, wrestling with dark powers and strange monsters, waking a sleeping princess—in quest of the fountain of youth or wisdom.

University of Pennsylvania

[21] O'Faolain, *op. cit.*, p. 73.

A GERMAN IMITATION OF FIELDING: MUSÄUS' *GRANDISON DER ZWEITE*

GUY STERN

IN 1762 appeared an anonymous German book which opened a new chapter in the history of the German novel.[1] Musäus' *Grandison der Zweite*, a satire of Samuel Richardson's *Sir Charles Grandison*, helped topple "the dictator Richardson," as Goethe once called him,[2] and ushered in the age of Fielding in German fiction. Its considerable if ephemeral influence can be gauged by the reaction of Herder, then one of Richardson's strongest champions. As late as 1768, six years after the publication of Musäus' novel, Herder felt constrained to come to the defense of Richardson, to demur (with some justification) at the extravagant praise heaped on *Grandison der Zweite* by some of its reviewers, and to warn, in an inadvertent compliment to the author, that reading the parody might destroy one's enjoyment of the original.[3]

Musäus' work is no longer an object of controversy. Nearly everyone agrees that *Grandison der Zweite* is the first German novel of stature written in the manner of Fielding—a characterization which, I suspect, is at once more and less true than generally believed. A re-evaluation of Musäus by the standards of the latest Fielding scholarship will show that Musäus in some way does not imitate Fielding's technique at all, that he sometimes comes very close to it,[4] and that in one respect he completely grasps and utilizes an essential aspect of Fielding's technique which scholars are only today beginning to appreciate.

Grandison der Zweite was written in a period favorable to experiment. German fiction had declined rapidly after the baroque period; and even the baroque masterworks, though still widely read, no longer satisfied the aesthetic demands of the German reader of the mid-

[1] The novel, subtitled *Geschichte des Herrn von N.* (Eisenach, 1760-62), was correctly attributed to Johann Karl August von Musäus within a year of publication.

[2] In a letter to Friederike Oeser, Nov. 6, 1768. See *Werke*, Weimar ed., IV. Abt., I, 173 f.

[3] "Einige Anmerkungen über Romane," *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. Suphan (Berlin, 1877), II, 320-324.

[4] There are several book-length studies of Musäus' novel: Emil Geschke, *Untersuchungen über die beiden Fassungen von Musäus Grandisonroman* (Königsberg, 1910); August Ohlmer, *Musäus als satirischer Romanschriftsteller* (Hildesheim, 1912); Emil Kost, "Die Technik des deutschen Romans von Musäus bis Goethe" (unpubl. diss., Tübingen, 1891). For an excellent concise estimate of Musäus' position in comparative literature, see Lienhard Bergel, "Cervantes in Germany," in *Cervantes Across the Centuries*, ed. Flores and Benardete (New York, 1947).

eighteenth century.[5] Thus any novel of quality, or even one with merely a fresh approach, was practically assured of publication and favorable reviews; a mature novel in Fielding's style with a German background, demanded for years by some of Germany's leading critics, was bound to receive an enthusiastic reception.[6] Moreover, Musäus' novel had been preceded by a flood of translations of Fielding's works and by numerous subliterary imitations which, while shortlived and without influence, at least prepared the German reader for a more sophisticated excursion in this new direction.[7] Finally, Johann Jakob Bodmer, who often determined literary fashion for German authors, had himself written a work, half novel, half pasquil, which introduced a successor of Sir Charles Grandison to the German scene.[8] The emergence of *Grandison der Zweite* was therefore far from surprising, or surprising only in the fact that it came so late—twenty years after the publication of *Joseph Andrews*.

Musäus' novel is basically a successful amalgam of a great variety of literary sources. But it is saved from being merely a derivative work by frequent flashes of original invention and by a unity which fuses a multitude of influences with no obvious jointures. In a remarkable tour de force, Musäus retains Richardson's epistolary style and much of his subject matter, both essential to the parody, and at the same time emulates the satiric technique of *Don Quixote*, *Joseph Andrews*, and *Jonathan Wild* and, occasionally, the complex craftsmanship of *Tom Jones*.

The novel unfolds in a manner familiar to us from *Joseph Andrews*. Joseph, inspired by the chaste deportment of his sister, decides to lead a life of continence; Herr von N., squire of Kargfeld (Barrenfield), imitates Sir Charles Grandison as an exemplar of all male virtues. After countless readings of Richardson's novel, Herr von N. accepts the narrative as fact and begins to convert his sleepy section of the Pomeranian hinterlands into a replica of Grandison's manor district. A somewhat addle-brained master of arts, Lampert Willibald, a relic of the times when Herr von N.'s niece and nephew were still in need of a tutor, has the greatness of Dr. Bartlett, Grandison's mentor, thrust upon him. The bewildered servants suddenly find themselves rechristened with the

[5] As shown by Wolfgang Kayser in his *Entstehung und Krise des modernen Romans* (Stuttgart, 1955), pp. 6, 12.

[6] The numerous critical demands for a "German Fielding" are compiled in Lawrence M. Price, *English Literature in Germany* (Berkeley, 1953), ch. XIV.

[7] See my "Fielding and the Sub-Literary Novel: A Study of Opitz' *Wilhelm von Hohenberg*," *Monatshefte*, XLVIII (1956), 295-306.

[8] *Geschichte Edward Grandisons in Görlitz* (Berlin, 1755). The novel, which appeared originally under Wieland's name, is now generally attributed to Bodmer. A well-documented argument for Bodmer as chief if not sole author appears in Fritz Budde, *Wieland und Bodmer* (Berlin, 1910), pp. 103-129. Price, p. 41, concurs.

names of their British counterparts; the hapless rustics must yield their household appliances to embellish the décor of British-style garden parties, while the local gentry, some of them completely illiterate, must join Herr von N.'s scholarly music- or art-appreciation societies despite their boredom.

Unable to curb Herr von N.'s folly, Baron von F., his nephew by marriage, and Amalia, his unmarried niece, plot to make him the butt of a fantastic hoax. Amalia's brother, in England at the time, furthers the scheme by reporting imaginary visits to Grandison Hall, meetings with the principal characters in Richardson's novel, and, in a final preposterous mingling of fact and fiction, with Samuel Richardson himself.

Encouraged in their quixotic zeal, the German squire and his tutor decide that love adventures are also an essential part in a life modeled on their English vis-à-vis, and, unmindful of their advanced age, press their spurious and unwelcome affections upon two girls, Juliane von W., a close friend of Amalia's, and Hannchen, the daughter of the local parson. Unlike Grandison's courtship of Henrietta Byron, Herr von N.'s suit brings not bliss but misery to the lady of his choice. Near tragedy ensues when Juliane's stepmother, in an effort to rid herself of her unwanted stepdaughter, furthers Herr von N.'s ludicrous suit and, by her complete dominance over a blustering husband, almost succeeds in her scheme. In a frenzy of plots and counterplots, in which servants lose their jobs and the atmosphere of a battlefield descends on the rustic community, the detested marriage is postponed just before the ceremony and, as the novel breaks off, has apparently been permanently frustrated.

Even this cursory summary of plot reveals some differences between the fiction of Musäus and Fielding. While *Joseph Andrews*, once past the initial chapters, transcends literary satire, *Grandison der Zweite* remains rooted to its parodic intent. In the broad sweep of Fielding's *Joseph Andrews* and *Tom Jones*, scenes and locale shift quickly in picaresque fashion; Musäus' novel remains stationary in tiny Kargfeld. Unable to curb the epistolary novel's tendency to formlessness, Musäus, like his predecessors Rousseau and Richardson, becomes its victim; his novel, too long and rambling, lacks Fielding's tight discipline and minute planning. At the end, by the author's own admission, "it breaks off like a rotten rope."[9] The motivation of the novel, though by no means arbitrary, falls short of Fielding's or Richardson's complex concatenation of motivating forces.

Some original touches enliven the satiric portions of the novel. Though Musäus occasionally appropriates a satiric device from Fielding in his social criticism of corrupt lawyers, tyrannical parents, un-

[9] *Der deutsche Grandison; auch eine Familiengeschichte* (Eisenach, 1781-82), II, 304.

Christian clergymen, and despotic rulers—the ironic metonymy of "great man" for great rogue (II, 128; III, 21) suggests a direct borrowing from *Jonathan Wild*—he is often highly ingenious and inventive in the structural form of his social satire. Official documents, church records, minutes of scholarly meetings, copies of recondite sophistic treatises (which various characters enclose in their letters) afford him the opportunity to satirize social groups not normally found in a small German village,[10] to mock the scholasticism of his age, and to expose the shallow cultural affectations of the rising lower nobility and middle class. In this last area of social satire Musäus' novel anticipates Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister*. The theatrical performances in the castle of Goethe's count, if more polished, are as inane and pretentious as Herr von N.'s art exhibits.

Many of the similarities between the craftsmanship of Fielding and Musäus are well known. Musäus modeled several characters on Fielding; he used, essentially, Fielding's method of mimesis; he demolished literary foes (e.g., Richardson, Gellert, and Leibnitz) with Fielding's type of ammunition;[11] he successfully copied Fielding's disciplined mode of narration in isolated episodes of his plot, and eschewed, like his model, characters either completely angelic or diabolical.

One aspect of Fielding's technique has only recently come under full critical scrutiny—his irony.[12] A review of our current insight into Fielding's irony will reveal perhaps the most striking identity with Musäus' imitation.

While it was apparent to Fielding's contemporaries that he treated Joseph Andrews, Parson Adams, and obviously Jonathan Wild much as Cervantes had treated Don Quixote, only in our times have critics discovered his ironic attitude toward such persons as Tom Jones and Squire Allworthy—and toward his readers.[13] Yet even these new in-

[10] A frequent target is the German army and its officers. Interestingly, Musäus uses a device typical of Fielding in satirizing Mathias Gallas, a general of the Thirty Years' War; Musäus' church historian, given to malapropisms like so many of Fielding's characters, spells the general's name *Pallasch* ("Turkish saber"), thereby implying that this German general was as destructive as the dreaded Turks.

[11] The subtle satire directed at Leibnitz (III, 115, 131) takes the form of an argument about the composition of the monads.

[12] Some studies of the past three decades which have contributed towards a definition of Fielding's irony are: Edward Hooker, "Humor in the Age of Pope," *HLQ*, XI (1948), 361-385; A. R. Humphreys, "Fielding's Irony; Its Methods and Effects," *RES*, XVIII (1942), 183-196; Archibald B. Shepperson, *The Novel in Motley; A History of the Burlesque Novel in English* (Cambridge, Mass., 1936); Marie Ramondt, "Between Laughter and Humor in the Eighteenth Century," *Neophil.*, XV (1956), 128, 138; Kayser, *op. cit.* I am indebted to Mr. James Hinkle of Denison University for observations on Fielding's irony.

[13] See R. S. Crane, "The Concept of Plot and the Plot of Tom Jones" in his *Critics and Criticisms; Ancient and Modern* (Chicago, 1952), on Allworthy's imperfections.

sights do not exhaust the full measure of Fielding's irony. An article published a few years ago, which analyzed the irony directed at Parson Adams, Square, and others, concluded: "It is true that in comparison with many of the other great ironists he appears to launch his attacks in no very subtle manner. His strategy is frontal and conceived in daylight; the ambiguities between what is said and what is intended are clear on the surface and do not attempt to spring surprises and betrayals."[14] This statement, while true of many of Fielding's "attacks," ignores his more subtle thrusts, in which the irony is so cleverly devious and so skillfully hidden that only the closest reading will uncover it.

I should like to offer two examples in support of this contention. In the preface to *Joseph Andrews* Fielding promises to expose hypocrisy; he frequently does so, in all his novels, by revealing the sexual indiscretions of the self-appointed guardians of morality. Square, the Platonic philosopher, is discovered in the garret bedroom of his paramour, and pious Bridget Allworthy conceived at least one if not both of her sons out of wedlock (*T. J.*, II, ii). Fielding similarly pillories Mrs. Seagrim (*T. J.*, IV, ix), a self-righteous puppeteer (*T. J.*, XII, v, vi), and Mrs. Fitzpatrick (*T. J.*, XI, vii, x). One vocal paragon of virtue, however, Mrs. Miller, the scrupulous widow of a clergyman, apparently escapes this mass indictment. Her moral fervor runs high when she threatens Tom with expulsion from his lodgings after a minor indiscretion on his part and when she bewails her daughter's premarital pregnancy (*T. J.*, XIV, iii, vi). But her moral righteousness is no more justified than that of her fellow prudes; the only difference is that Fielding has destroyed her pretensions not with a bludgeon but a rapier. If we examine closely the lady's past, we find that she has been no more discreet than her daughter. We completely miss the ambiguity of her statement that she "was married to a clergyman who had been . . . [her] lover a long time before" until we ponder two facts separated by some fifty-odd pages of text—that her daughters were born seven years apart, but that her marriage lasted only five years (*T. J.*, XIII, v; XIV, v). Fielding's irony in this instance is all the more devastating for its deft concealment.

He is equally subtle in the final gentle thrust aimed at Parson Adams, at once one of his favorite characters and one of the primary targets of his irony. Fielding had been at pains throughout *Joseph Andrews* to shatter many of the good parson's innocent pretensions—his stoicism vanishes when confronted with the news, fortunately mistaken, of his little son's death, and his vaunted logic breaks down after his nocturnal mishaps at Booby Hall, which he ascribes to witchcraft, despite all

[14] Humphreys, *loc. cit.*, p. 183. But cf. Allan Wendt, "The Moral Allegory of *Jonathan Wild*," *ELH*, XXIV (1957), 306-320, who convincingly argues for the presence of a subtler type of irony in *J. W.*

empirical evidence to the contrary (*J. A.*, IV, viii, xiv). At the conclusion of *Tom Jones* Fielding subtly disposes of yet another of Adams' pretensions. In the closing pages of *Joseph Andrews* (IV, xvi) Adams resolved never to leave his parishioners and accepted an additional living only after being assured that he need not thereby break his promise. But he ends up—the length of a novel later—at the house of Squire Allworthy (*T. J.*, XVIII, xiii).

Similar substrata of concealed irony lie beneath the banter directed at the reader. While we are not likely to stay deceived for long when Fielding directs us to go to Tyburn for Tom's impending execution (*T.J.*, XVII, i), or when he enjoins us to regard Jonathan Wild in truth as a great man (*J. W.*, I, i and *passim*) and Lady Booby as the heroine of *Joseph Andrews* (*J. A.*, I, viii), we have, it seems, often been misled by the inherent irony in some of Fielding's other addresses to his public. One wonders today whether the elaborate preface to *Joseph Andrews* is not in fact a "leg-pull upon his academic readers"[15]; and several "editorial" comments of the author seem to have been inserted, tongue in cheek, primarily to obscure premature clues to the novel's solution. In this elaborate game with his readers Fielding intimates from the beginning that Joseph is not really Pamela's brother ("he was esteemed to be"); then he quickly makes us forget this near revelation by diverting us with a bantering remark addressed to "the curious reader" (*J. A.*, I, ii). Similarly, he uses a mock-serious commentary on human behavior to cover up for the revelation that Tom is indeed Allworthy's nephew (*T. J.*, XII, x).

It is futile to speculate whether Musäus was consciously aware of these subtleties in Fielding. He does not discuss them in his critical writings.[16] But, being himself an ironist by nature (generations of critics have cavilled at the ironic tone which pervades even his fairy tales),[17] he undoubtedly sensed Fielding's subtle approach and perpetuated it in *Grandison der Zweite*. Moreover, only an ironic intent explains one feature of the novel which, despite its uniqueness (I know of no other example in fiction), has invited little critical commentary.

Musäus begins his novel with brief character sketches of the chief persons; then he covers the same ground once more with the explanation that one of his characters, Lampert Willibald, would, if given the chance, describe these persons quite differently. Indeed, Willibald's hypothetical description differs from that of the author in several major

[15] Delancey Ferguson, "A Scholarly Vindication of the Author of *Tom Jones*" (rev. of F. Homes Dudden, *Henry Fielding*), *Herald Tribune Book Rev.*, Jan. 18, 1953, p. 4.

[16] The majority of Musäus' reviews and critical writings appeared in the *Allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek*.

[17] See Dorothea Berger, "*Die Volksmärchen der Deutschen* von Musäus: Ein Meisterwerk der deutschen Rokokodichtung," *PMLA*, LXIX (1954), 1200.

respects. Why, one wonders, did Musäus insert a seemingly gratuitous second introduction?

A dual purpose is discernible behind the double introduction. In the first part the author has the opportunity, possibly his only opportunity, to give an ironic account of his characters; once he had committed himself to the epistolary form, he had to forego the ironic characterizations which Fielding scatters throughout his novels in his role of omniscent narrator. Musäus needed the introductions, because he had to disappear as narrator once the letters began.[18] The first introduction thus becomes the instrument for his ironic treatment of his characters. The second part, purportedly written by Lampert Willibald, not only exposes the affectations of this worthy but, more important, is the starting point for the cat-and-mouse game which Musäus plays with his readers in the manner of Fielding.

The ironic treatment of the characters in the first part of the introduction takes two forms. Sometimes it is straightforward and obvious. The hero's sister, described as a withered bag of bones, "prefers to stay unmarried . . . although she is only fifty-six years old"; the villainess is introduced as an expert "in the art of torturing her step-daughter." The local school teacher "has a mind filled with many lofty intentions and a goodly number of rogueries . . . He leads an exemplary life and has by nature a casuistic conscience." By coupling two incongruous statements, Musäus makes clear at once that the first is meant ironically.

But Musäus also emulates Fielding's subtle irony or "double entendre of character"[19] when—much later in the novel—he explodes an apparently straightforward, nonironic introductory character sketch. This "time-bomb" method of ironic characterization, analogous to Fielding's exposure of Parson Adams and Mrs. Miller, is skillfully woven into the plot and confounds the reader each time anew by its ingenious variations. Baron von F., one of the conspirators in the deception of the German Grandison, appears in the introduction as a wise counselor. "He steers many people away from their favorite follies and thereby merits the choicest New Year's wishes of his pastor." But, as it turns out, it is the baron who first conceives the hoax against von N., who consistently encourages the folly of the two deluded heroes, and who revives the spirits of his co-conspirators whenever they tire of the protracted practical joke (I, 21; I, 35; I, 81; I, 182; I, 199).

Herr von S., the hero's nephew, is another victim of this type of irony. "He was once a gay blade" (sehr munter), the introduction tells us, "but is supposed to have changed considerably abroad." The aver-

[18] Goethe, writing *Werther* nine years after the publication of Musäus' novel, solved this problem by repeatedly interspersing "editorial comments" between the letters.

[19] A term coined by William Hazlitt, *Lectures on the English Comic Writers*, 3rd ed. (London, 1841), p. 155, to describe Fielding's irony.

age eighteenth-century reader, convinced of the beneficial effects of the grand tour, would be unlikely to sense the ambiguity of the words "supposed to" (soll), until Musäus in the body of his novel explodes both the myth of the grand tour and the reformation of von S.'s character. Von S. enters into the spirit of the practical joke with boundless enthusiasm, apparently spends considerably more time on the Münchhausen-like letters than on cultural pursuits, does not scruple to forge a letter from the British Royal Academy of Science (I, 157), and derives as much pleasure from "the Grandison affair" as from his visits to St. Paul's and St. James' Palace (I, 335).

This type of irony is not confined to the major characters. A pastor, described as "kreuzbrav,"[20] turns out to be a fanatic who scents heresy in the most innocent books or amusements (I, 85; III, 259; III, 260). A groom, who by the testimony of the introduction is being steadily improved under the tutelage of Lampert Willibald, in fact loses his common sense through Lampert's ministrations and is converted to "Grandisonism" (I, 10). The village barber, introduced as a splendid surgeon, scarcely merits this encomium when his surgical tool kit produces an assortment of pliers, saws, and axes (I, 68). In the sketch of Lorenz Lobesan, village teacher and organist, Musäus produces a variation upon his contrapuntal juxtaposition of introduction and novel. The introduction states: "He was born, as he says, when the Turks were besieging Vienna. His grandfather died in consequence of the large comet of that time" (i.e., in 1682). Why, we wonder, does Musäus cite his character's references to the Turks and to Halley's comet? In the course of the novel the irony of this information becomes apparent—the Turks and Halley's comet are obsessions of the good schoolmaster. Mistaking a regiment of Croat soldiers for Turkish invaders—some seventy-odd years after the repulsion of the Turks—he cowers in fear behind the church organ (I, 54). And, asked to furnish a short extract of some church records, he punctuates the pertinent data with four items dealing with his two favorite obsessions (I, 165 ff.).

The second introduction helps to expose Lampert Willibald, its purported author, whose claim that he is a highly respected teacher and his employer "the flower and ornament of German knighthood" are exposed in the novel itself. But Musäus also turns this second introduction into an arena for an intellectual joust with his readers, where Fielding's type of irony serves him as his principal weapon.

Halfway through the introduction Musäus addresses his readers directly: "The reader need know no more of any of the characters for

[20] The word *kreuzbrav* (decent to the core) literally means "decent to the cross." Musäus may here be using a pun for ironic treatment of a character. Note that elsewhere (I, 88) he bases an elaborate ironic passage on a play on the literal and connotative meaning of the word *Lauffeuer* (wild fire, lit. "running fire").

FEB 5 1959

his perusal of Part One." This sentence is one more jibe at the reader who, before the introduction is over, will have been subjected to a bewildering set of directions and misdirections. The "editor" has been anything but candid with us in his character analyses and the reader's befuddlement is compounded when Lampert contributes his own extravagantly subjective version. For at this point the reader has no reason to doubt the word of the ex-tutor; Musäus carefully avoided discrediting him in the first part of the introduction. The commonplace that "nature has done everything for this valuable specimen which it could [be expected] to do for a master of arts who did not maliciously oppose nature" is ambiguous in the extreme, and the flattering designation of Lampert as "a modern Theophrastus" lends weight to his subsequent opinions. As a last ironic shot before the novel proper opens, where order emerges out of deliberate chaos, the author tells us that "all the characters are alive and feel well."

Occasionally Musäus succeeds, despite the limitations of the epistolary form, in introducing this mobile type of irony into the novel itself. One character, attempting to delude another, imparts fallacious information to his correspondent and, of course, to the reader. This deception is particularly effective in one missive, where the writer informs us that the wiles of the villainous stepmother have succeeded and the abhorrent marriage has actually been consummated (I, 240). Most ironic of all is Musäus' promise to reveal his identity toward the end of his novel; but, well aware that the curiosity of his readers would mount steadily during the course of his impudent satire of Richardson, Musäus, in a last bit of irony fails to keep his promise.

Musäus revised his novel twenty years after the publication of the first edition. But by then he had dropped from the avant-garde of German fiction writers; his importance for the development of the German novel rests not on the more polished *Der deutsche Grandison*, but on the earlier *Grandison der Zweite*, whose significance transcends the distinction of being the first literate imitation of Fielding. While Musäus' predecessors had been content to borrow an occasional character or incident, the creator of *Grandison der Zweite* captured the ironic mood of Fielding's works—long before it had been defined by literary historians—and introduced a note of sophistication and urbanity into German fiction, a note which reappears in the novels of Wieland and Goethe and can be recognized in the "irony" of Germany's romantic poets.

Denison University

"THE TRUTH" IN JOHN FORD'S *THE BROKEN HEART*

GIOVANNI M. CARSANIGA

FORD'S tragedy *The Broken Heart* seems to have little connection with fact. The plot is improbable, and the setting in an unlikely Sparta during the war against Messene is altogether fabulous. The story apparently does not derive from any known literary source. For this very reason Ford's statement in the Prologue is striking:

> What may be here thought a *Fiction*, when times youth
> Wanted some riper years, was known a *Truth*.

Naturally these lines have aroused the interest of the critics, and several suggestions and conjectures have been advanced. A. W. Ward thought that the story, "which savours of mediaeval Italy," might be derived from some unknown contemporary novel.[1] Havelock Ellis remarked that the unknown novel might be Italian, though he did not suggest which one, nor did he explain why Ford should have transferred events from Italy to Sparta.[2] In 1909 Stuart P. Sherman proposed the most attractive theory about the historical origin of this "truth" which according to Ford's statement, lies at the root of the drama.[3] *The Broken Heart*, says Sherman, "is set in Sparta to veil a true English love story from an English audience; that seems the almost inevitable explanation." The Spartan setting and the name of King Amyclas are, Sherman has pointed out, clearly reminiscent of Sidney's *Arcadia*, and this gives us the clue to the whole problem. Another consideration that leads us to Philip Sidney is the deep interest that Ford took when he was young in the love story of Penelope Devereux, Sidney's Stella; to Stella, then countess of Devonshire, he dedicated his *Fame's Memorial*.

Two more points should be added to Sherman's suggestion that Ford had Sidney's *Arcadia* in mind when he wrote *The Broken Heart*: the oracle in the play is contrived with the same ingenious and clever antitheses as in Sidney's romance, and the names of the characters are clearly set forth, by both Sidney and Ford, with a moralistic purpose hinted at by their Greek names.

Before meeting Devonshire, Penelope Devereux was loved by Philip Sidney. Sherman draws between their story and that of Orgylus and Penthea a striking and accurate comparison. Like Ithocles' father and Crotolon, Sir Henry Sidney and the Earl of Essex were not on friendly

[1] *A History of English Dramatic Literature* (London, 1875), III, chap. 8.
[2] *John Ford* (London, 1888), p. 184.
[3] "Stella and the *Broken Heart*," *PMLA*, XXIV (1909), 274-285.

terms. Penelope's engagement with Philip was broken by her guardian after her father's death, and she unwillingly married Lord Rich, a violent and jealous man. The sentimental situation between Astrophel and Stella is similar to that between Orgylus and Penthea, the former faithful to his love passion, the latter to her honor.

Miss M. J. Sargeaunt has also considered the problem of the "truth" and thinks that there is no reason to doubt Ford's statement. "It seems probable," she says, "that some part of the main plot is founded on fact."[4] But she does not agree with Sherman, because in her opinion Stella's character is very different from Penthea's, and the outcome of the two love stories is also so different as to render it difficult to believe that one is modeled upon the other. This is also the opinion of H. J. Oliver, who writes:

> There could, then, easily be some truth in Sherman's view; but one would need to add that Orgylus is hardly an adaptation of Astrophel, even in the broadest sense of the word 'adaptation'; the sterility of Penthea's husband, Bassanes, makes the situation of the play a special one; and the whole outcome of Ford's story is almost the opposite of Astrophel's resignation, in an inverted spirit of romance.[5]

We might suppose, then, having no other explanation at hand, that Ford was referring to some unknown, perhaps oral, story which has not been handed down to posterity. But this is rather hard to believe, since there would be little use hinting at a story which was not known to the theater audiences; and, if there is reference to a well-known story, it is difficult to think that no other record of it has survived. In two other cases Ford based his plot, written in collaboration, on everyday news, that is, *The Witch of Edmonton* and *A late Murder of the Son upon the Mother*; in both cases we know something of the happenings, of no particular significance, from which he drew his plots.

Let us consider for a moment why Ford attempts to impress upon his audience the "truth" contained in his tragedy. The usual purpose of a prologue is to clarify the artistic intention of the tragedy, to tell the antecedent facts if necessary, and to prepare the listeners to accept some extraordinary accident which otherwise would hardly be believed. In this particular case it seems fair to assume that Ford wanted to justify to some degree the violence of the passions which harass his characters, and so informed his audience that he was not abusing the freedom of artistic invention by creating impossible characters—that what he represented on the stage was not only possible in real life, but had actually happened:

> This law we keep in our presentment now,
> Not to take freedom more than we allow;
> What may be here thought a Fiction, when times youth
> Wanted some riper years, was known a Truth.

---

[4] M. J. Sargeaunt, *John Ford* (Oxford, 1935), p. 111.
[5] H. J. Oliver, *The Problem of John Ford* (Melbourne, 1955), p. 60.

One of the most shocking features of Ford's tragedy is undoubtedly the cold murder of Ithocles, who is entangled in the trap-chair. This chair is by no means Ford's invention; we find it in the ancient myth of Ἥρας δεσμοί[6] where it is contrived by Hephaestus against Hera. A dramatic antecedent is found in Barnaby Barnes' *The Devil's Charter*, a gloomy and somber drama about Pope Alexander VI. In the fifth scene of the first act, Lucretia Borgia is preparing to kill her husband, Gismondo di Viselli. She comes in, "alone in her night gowne untired, bringing in a chaire which she planteth upon the stage." Shortly afterwards she soliloquizes:

> I have devised such a curious snare
> As jealious Vulcan never yet devis'd
> To graspe his armes unable to resist
> Death instruments enclosed in these hands.[7]

The reference to Vulcan makes clear that Barnes draws the idea of the trap-chair from the myth. His chair is different from Ford's. It is made to function by Lucretia ("She graspeth him in his chaire") some time after Gismondo sat down; in Ford's chair a spring is started by the weight of the victim itself ("Ithocles sits down, the chair closes upon him").

This murderous device does not belong only to mythical or tragical fantasy. On March 17, 1551, in Antwerp, the Lucchese merchant Simone Turchi killed his fellow citizen Jeronimo Deodati by using exactly the same kind of chair described in Ford's tragedy. This murder is recorded in the Antwerp archives and is mentioned by several writers. An account of it is found in Girolamo Cardano's *De Rerum Varietate*:

> [Symon Turca] acceperat in facie ab eo [i.e. Joanne Baptista Deodato] vulnus, et simulata pace in viridarium quod hac causa conduxerat juxta urbis pomarium (erat autem urbs ipsa Antuerpia emporium toto orbe celebre) cathedram transtulit in qua, cum quisque sederet, statim atque sponte ita claudebatur ut sessorem undique constringeret. Eo ergo invitato commercii titulo (nam ambo erant Lucenses ambo mercatores) sedere illum hortatur; sedit; statim vinculis ferreis indique constringitur. Tunc Turca, gladio educto, "iam es" inquit "in manibus meis, improbe: eo te deduxi qua optaram." Ille rogabat, veniam petebat, supplicabat, sed omnia in irritum. Multis eum vulneribus spectantemque mala sua confodit, vultu prius dilacerato, quod in vultu vulnus (ut dixi) ipse accepisset. Sed deprehensus, miro casu publice in eadem cathedra totidemque ac similibus vulneribus, Perila exemplo, mactatus est. Ut vere credam paucos maleficarum artium inventores inventione sua gaudere.[8]

The same murder is more faithfully recorded by Jehan Leblond,

[6] See L. Malten, s.v. "Hephaistos," in Pauly-Wissowa *Real-Encyclopädie für Altertumwissenschaft*, VIII (1913), 343-346.

[7] B. Barnes, *The Devil's Charter*, ed. R. B. McKerrow, in *Materialien zur Kunde d. älteren Engl. Dramas* (Louvain, 1907), vol. VI.

[8] Hyeronimi Cardani, *De Rerum Varietate*, XI, liii. I have used the Lyons edition, published "apud Stephanum Michelem" in 1580.

translator of the *Chronicle* of Johannes Carion: "Lequel delict fut tantost decelé, & pour iceluy ledict Turquy bruslé tout vif dedans la chaire mesme," which is the account as we know it from official records.[9]

The best description of this event is found in one of Matteo Bandello's *Novelle* (Part Four) entitled, *Simone Turchi ha nemistà con Gierɔnimo Deodati lucchese: seco si reconcilia, e poi con inaudita maniera lo ammazza, ed egli vivo è arso in Anversa.* Bandello wanted to print this story in one of the first three parts, but the family of Simone Turchi, still powerful in Lucca, put pressure on the Lucchese government to prevent Vincenzo Busdrago from printing it. Bandello later included it in the fourth part, asking the Lyons printer Alessandro Marsili to begin the book with it. For some unknown reason, Marsili printed it as the twenty-seventh story. Bandello himself heard it from the Florentine merchant Niccolò Nettoli. The story is one of his best, full of dramatic details and of psychological accuracy. A Lucchese scholar, Mario Mazzolani, has provided ample evidence of the historical truth of Bandello's story, which corresponds in every detail to the accounts in the known sources.[10]

Strangely enough, this story seems not to have been translated in Elizabethan England; it is not to be found in any of the translations of Bandello mentioned in the surveys of Miss Scott[11] and René Pruvost,[12] unless we admit the existence of the mysterious English translation published by some W. W. in 1580, mentioned by Warton.[13] However this is not a serious hindrance, because Ford very likely read it in the original. At any rate, since the murder of Jeronimo Deodati shocked nearly all Europe and was widely publicized in the Netherlands, Germany, France, and Italy, Ford might have heard about it in many different ways. Bandello's tale was first pointed out as a possible source of Ford's tragedy by Dyce in his additions to Gifford's edition of Ford's works, printed in 1869, then by Ward, and lastly by Miss Scott, who included without comment *The Broken Heart* in her list of twenty-seven plays upon subjects taken from Bandello's *Novelle*. Apparently these scholars did not know that the tale is not a mere piece of fiction, but the account of an historical fact; and this possibly explains why no one has related this source to Ford's statement of its "truth," and why Sherman, Miss Sargeaunt, and Oliver did not even mention Bandello's name in their attempts to solve the problem.

[9] *Les Chroniques de Jean Carion Philosophi . . . traduict en François par Maistre Jehan Leblond* (Paris, 1553), p. 329 r.

[10] Mario Mazzolani, "Storia di un delitto famoso e commento ad una novella del Bandello," in *Bollettino Storico Lucchese*, VIII (1936), 125-162, where full details about all historical sources are given.

[11] M. A. Scott, *Elizabethan Translations from Italian* (New York, 1916).

[12] René Pruvost, *Matteo Bandello and the Elizabethan Fiction* (Paris, 1937).

[13] Warton, *History of English Poetry* (London, 1791), III, 473.

Now, if we accept Sherman's hypothesis, we know at least two facts which could have provided the material for Ford's plot. This is in no way inconsistent with Ford's statement that "what may be here thought a Fiction . . . was known a Truth." He does not mean that his entire plot closely follows a single story, but that some of the events in his tragedy (at least two, we contend) had their origin in some real happenings: the love story drawn on the model of Sidney and Stella, and the extraordinary artifice contrived for murder by a Lucchese merchant. Of course the meek and resigned outcome of Sidney's love could not be the ending of an Elizabethan tragedy—which explains why Orgylus cannot be an adaptation of Astrophel even in the broadest sense of the word. But the somber, deceitful, cold-blooded, and vindictive character of Orgylus may very well be an adaptation of Simone Turchi.

University of Aberdeen

MOBY DICK IN GERMANY

LELAND R. PHELPS

CARL JUNG, in his essay, "Psychologie und Dichtung" (1930), referred to *Moby Dick* as the greatest American novel and recommended it as a subject particularly well suited for psychological investigation.[1] The opinion of this authority apparently passed without notice; for one searches in vain for German reaction to *Moby Dick* during the 1930s and early 1940s. It was not until after World War II that Melville's novel of the white whale attained for the Germans the full status of a great work of literature.

The reception of the work in Germany presents something of a problem. A German translation which appeared in 1927 attracted no critical attention whatsoever. The belated publication of a German translation of the novel is not, in itself, surprising, for even in the English-speaking countries the Melville renaissance did not really begin until 1921, with the publication of Weaver's *Herman Melville, Mariner and Mystic*. It does seem puzzling, however, that the 1927 translation of *Moby Dick* was neglected not only by the scholarly journals but also by the popular literary periodicals. This neglect could not have been due to any basic inability to understand the work on the part of the Germans. A second translation of the novel, which appeared in 1946, proved very successful.[2] In 1951 a third translation was published[3] and in 1954 a fourth.[4] An artist, Will Sohl, created in 1949 an impressive series of lithographs based on characters and scenes from the novel,[5] and an abridged edition of the work for young people was published in 1950.[6]

H. G. Scheffauer, one of the editors of Romane der Welt, the series in which the 1927 translation of *Moby Dick* appeared, wrote a short rhapsodic essay on Melville in which he heralded the novel as one of the most original and impressive works of modern literature, and predicted that the metaphysical undercurrent in *Moby Dick* would speak more clearly and urgently to the German spirit than it had to the Anglo-

[1] C. G. Jung, "Psychologie und Dichtung," in E. Ermatinger, ed., *Philosophie der Literaturwissenschaft* (Berlin, 1930), p. 317.

[2] H. Melville, *Moby Dick*, trans. T. Mutzenbecher and E. Schnabel (Hamburg, 1946), 3rd ed., 1950.

[3] H. Melville, *Der weiße Wal*, trans. W. Termee (Bonn, 1951).

[4] H. Melville, *Moby Dick*, trans. R. Mummendey and illust. H. Pridohl (Berlin, 1954).

[5] Reprints of two of the lithographs appeared in *Thema*, VII (1950): p. 25, Ahab leaves the "Pequod"; p. 27, Queequeg.

[6] H. Melville, *Moby Dick. Die Jagd nach dem weißen Wal*, trans. and abr. K. Bahnmüller (Reutlingen, 1950).

Saxon.[7] He was right; the novel could and, beginning in 1946, did "speak to the German spirit." To understand why a work of the stature of *Moby Dick*, appearing in a series reputed to contain German translations of important world novels, was neglected by the critics, we must consider Melville's reputation in Germany prior to 1927, the reputation of the series Romane der Welt, and the caliber of the translation itself.

Only three works by Melville appeared in German during his lifetime: *Typee*,[8] *Omoo*,[9] and *Redburn*.[10] Relatively low sales of the American and English editions of *Moby Dick*, together with the controversial nature of the early reviews of the novel,[11] were probably the main reasons for its neglect by German publishers at the time. Melville was either completely disregarded[12] or only briefly mentioned[13] in most of the German works concerned with American literature published between 1860 and 1927, the year in which not only *Moby Dick* but also *Typee* and *Omoo* were issued in the Romane der Welt series. For most of the German literary historians during this long period, Melville was a minor writer, an author of exotic and adventurous sea tales.[14]

Beginning early in 1927 the Berlin publisher Knaur planned to issue each Friday an inexpensive translation of an "outstanding world novel." The series was to be called Romane der Welt; Thomas Mann, who was co-editor, wrote an introductory essay for the first volume, a German

---

[7] H. Melville, *Taipi*, trans. K. Federn with preface by H. G. Scheffauer (Berlin, 1927), p. 9.

[8] H. Melville, *Vier Monate auf den Marquesas Inseln oder ein Blick auf polynesisches Leben*, trans. R. Garrique, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1846).

[9] H. Melville, *Omoo oder Abenteuer im Stillen Ocean mit einer Einleitung, die sich den Marquesas Inseln anschließt und Tobys glückliche Flucht enthält*, trans. F. Gerstäcker, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1847).

[10] H. Melville, *Redburns erste Reise*, trans. L. Marezoll (Grimma, 1850). This edition comprised vols. XXV-XXXIII in the series Nationalbibliothek classischer Romane der Lieblingsschriftsteller aller Völker; the following year, 1851, *Redburn* was reissued in three volumes in the series Europäische Bibliothek der neuen belletristischen Literatur.

[11] H. W. Hetherington, "Early Reviews of *Moby Dick*," in *Moby Dick Centennial Essays* (Dallas, Tex., 1953), pp. 89 ff.

[12] L. Herrig, *Handbuch der nordamerikanischen National-Literatur* (Braunschweig, 1854); R. Doehn, *Aus dem amerikanischen Dichterwald* (Leipzig, 1881); E. Engel, *Geschichte der englischen Literatur von den Anfangen bis zur Gegenwart. Mit Anhang, Die nordamerikanische Literatur* (Leipzig, 1883); O. von Leixner, *Illustrierte Geschichte der fremden Literatur*, 2 vols. (Leipzig and Berlin, 1883); E. P. Evans, *Beiträge zur amerikanischen Literatur- und Kulturgeschichte* (Stuttgart, 1898); C. A. Smith, *Die amerikanische Literatur* (Berlin, 1912).

[13] K. Brunnemann, *Geschichte der nordamerikanischen Literatur* (Leipzig, 1866), p. 93; K. Knortz, *Geschichte der nordamerikanischen Literatur* (Berlin, 1891), II, 470; L. Kellner, *Geschichte der nordamerikanischen Literatur* (Berlin and Leipzig, 1913), p. 89. Kellner went further than the other two literary historians here mentioned in that he praised Melville as a realist, placing him above Zola and the Goncourts.

[14] K. Brunnemann, *op. cit.*, p. 93; K. Knortz, *op. cit.*, II, 470.

FEB 5 1959

translation of Hugh Walpole's *Portrait of a Man with Red Hair*. Mann stated that the primary purpose of the project was to help the reader widen his spiritual scope ("seeliche Ausdehnung").[15] He promised prospective readers of the series intensification of life ("Steigerung des Lebensgefühls") rather than entertainment.[16] The first works issued were: Hugh Walpole, *Portrait of a Man with Red Hair*; Maurice Leblanc, *The Woman with Green Eyes* and *The Island of Thirty Coffins*; Victor M. Lonas, *Whiskey Pirate*; Zane Grey, *The Border Legion*; G. B. Shaw, *Cashel Byron's Profession*; H. Melville, *Typee*.

One German critic, surveying these initial volumes, wrote a scathing review of the undertaking in which he accused the publisher and editors of offering the German public selections which were predominantly trash ("Schundliteratur").[17] The only works in the group which he exempted from this judgment were *Typee* and *Cashel Byron's Profession*, and even these he did not consider worthy of being labeled important world novels. The reviewer failed to find in any of the initial selections the spiritual rewards promised by Thomas Mann.[18] Without exception the periodicals which reviewed these first offerings neglected all subsequent works in the Knaur series.[19] A glance at the American novels published in Romane der Welt between 1927 and 1930 will help explain the critical rejection of the project. In addition to the three novels by Melville, fourteen works by Zane Grey were issued, six by Max Brand, and three by James Oliver Curwood. The poor reputation of the series was one of the reasons the translations of Melville's novels failed to attract the critical attention they deserved.

Furthermore, the first German translation of *Moby Dick* was woefully inadequate. The German text consisted of sixty-three untitled chapters and the epilogue. There was no dedication, and the sections "Etymology" and "Extracts," each abridged to about one-third, appeared at the end of the work. Great liberties were taken with the novel in preparing it for its first publication in German. Sentences, paragraphs, pages, and whole chapters were omitted. The famous opening words of the novel, "Call me Ishmael," were omitted. Approximately one-half of the original chapters were not translated and an additional one-fourth had deletions ranging from a sentence to several pages. Only thirty-six chapters and the epilogue appeared unabridged. The result was an emasculated version of the novel which Scheffauer had described as one of the most original and impressive works of modern literature.

---

[15] T. Mann, "Geleitwort für die Romane der Welt," in H. Walpole, *Bildnis eines Rothaarigen*, trans. P. Baudisch (Berlin, 1927), p. 11.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 12.

[17] W. Vesper, "Romane der Welt," *Die schöne Literatur*, XXVIII (1927), 313.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 312.

[19] *Zeitschrift für Bücherfreunde, Die Literatur, Die schöne Literatur.*

The translation can be read as an adventure story. However, to anyone acquainted with the original work, the omissions present an almost insurmountable barrier to even a superficial perusal of this first German edition. Occasional passages seem to indicate that there might be some deeper meaning to the story than appears on the surface; but the pervasive metaphysical undercurrent which Scheffauer thought would appeal so urgently to the German spirit is lacking. The center of emphasis in the novel frequently shifts and the balance between the parts and the whole is disturbed or completely destroyed. The relationship of Ishmael to Queequeg, for example, is cast in an entirely false light because the chapters concerned with Ishmael's adventures before signing on as a member of the Pequod's crew are missing.

Of the many chapters concerned with technical problems of whaling and the natural history of whales, only one, "The Sperm Whale's Head," was retained. "The Whiteness of the Whale," that all-important discussion of the color white and its implications, was omitted, as were the chapters concerned with Jonah, "The Sermon" and "Jonah Historically Regarded." "Sunset," which contains Ahab's soliloquy on his "madness maddened," is also missing. Other major omissions include the Town-Ho's story, the adventure with the ship "Rose-Bud" and the ambergris, and Starbuck's dramatic struggle with the rifle outside Ahab's cabin door. The work suffered not only in its metaphysical significance but also on the external dramatic level. The 1927 translation of *Moby Dick* did not deserve and did not receive any critical attention; this abridgement was no more qualified to be called an important world novel than most of the other works issued in the Romane der Welt.

In 1929 a new history of American literature, by W. Fischer, was published in Germany. The treatment of Melville in this work is a complete departure from that of previous German literary historians. For the first time he is referred to as a poet ("ein Dichter") whose language can be compared to the finest in English.[20] *Moby Dick* is singled out as his masterpiece, the sublime work of a writer with an inexhaustible fantasy.[21] This view of the novel was not shared by all German scholars of American literature at the time. There was, for example, H. Lüdeke's article, which maintains that not *Moby Dick* but rather the early novels depicting the healthy simple life among the natives of the South Seas revealed Melville's true essence ("wahres Wesen").[22]

In academic circles there was an increasing interest in Melville. Two doctoral dissertations appeared in 1937, one on his style[23] and one on the

[20] W. Fischer, *Die englische Literatur der Vereinigten Staaten von Nordamerika* (Wildpark-Potsdam, 1929), p. 61.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 62.

[22] H. Lüdeke, "Neuhumanismus und Demokratie im amerikanischen Geistesleben," *Germanisch-Romanisches Monatsheft*, XXI (1933), 228.

[23] W. Weber, *Herman Melville, eine stilistische Untersuchung* (Basel, 1937).

sources of his thought.[24] In the introduction to his dissertation on Melville's style, W. Weber states that he hopes to arouse some general interest in the writer.[25] Although a doctoral dissertation can expect to reach only a limited circle of specialists, the fact is that the following year, 1938, actually was the crucial year for general interest in Melville in Germany. *Billy Budd* and *Benito Cereno* were translated into German for the first time.[26] The reviewers were cognizant of the importance of this literary event and expressed the hope that Germans would now discover Melville's greatness.[27] They tried to arouse interest in *Moby Dick*, but their attempts did not succeed. Some years were still to pass before a complete translation became available in Germany.

During the summer of 1938, Professor W. P. Friederich lectured at the University of Bern on various aspects of American literature and history. One of the lectures was entitled "Ein amerikanischer Gottsucher: Herman Melville."[28] Interest in Melville had finally begun to spread in the German-speaking countries and, by 1938, it was no longer possible to neglect him in discussions of American letters.

The first complete translation of *Moby Dick* into German was made for a book club in Switzerland in 1942[29] and a second German translation was published in that country two years later.[30] But neither of these was available in Germany at the time. In 1944 Jean Giono's highly imaginative little work, *Pour saluer Melville*, came out in Germany. The introduction to the German translation announced the translation of *Moby Dick* which finally appeared in 1946.[31] Most German critics received the novel enthusiastically, greeting it not as American literature but as world literature.[32]

But not all reaction to Melville had suddenly become favorable. The few lines which Julius Bab, the drama critic, devotes to Melville in his book on America's poets contain no plaudits. *Moby Dick* is charac-

[24] K. H. Sundermann, *Herman Melvilles Gedankengut* (Berlin, 1937).

[25] Weber, *op. cit.*, p. iii.

[26] H. Melville, *Billy Budd*, trans. R. Möring (Hamburg, 1938); H. Melville, *Benito Cereno*, trans. R. Kraushaar, with introductory essay by H. Hennecke (Berlin, 1938).

[27] H. Stresau, "Herman Melville," *Europäische Revue*, XIV (1938), 329.

[28] W. P. Friederich, *Werden und Wachsen der USA in 300 Jahren* (Bern, 1939).

[29] H. Melville, *Moby Dick*, trans. V. M. von Seggern, illust. O. Tschumi (Zürich, 1942).

[30] H. Melville, *Moby Dick*, trans. F. Güttinger (Zürich, 1944).

[31] J. Giono, *Melville zum Gruß*, trans. W. Gerull-Kardes (Hamburg, 1944), p. 7.

[32] R. Andersch, "Widerpart der Natur," *Frankfurter Hefte*, III (1948); H. von Cube, *"Moby Dick," Welt und Wort*, II (1947); C. Hohoff, "Herman Melvilles weißer Wal," *Hochland*, XLII (1950); G. Engels, "Herman Melville," *Begegnung*, V (1950); H. G. Oliass, "Herman Melville," *Welt und Wort*, VI (1951); E. Vietta, "Herman Melville—Gedanken über den Dichter des reinen Seins," *Der Monat*, IV (1952).

terized as a work permeated with a fantastic pessimism, which, according to Bab, accounts for the Melville vogue among the younger generation after World War II.[33] In 1951 appeared H. Plischke's *Von Cooper bis Karl May*, which claimed to be a history of the ethnological adventure novel. In such a work Melville, as the author of some of the first outstanding and popular South Sea novels, should have received some attention. He is, however, relegated to the role of "a contemporary of Friedrich Gerstäcker".[34] In actuality, Gerstäcker, a popular German novelist, was a follower of Melville. He translated *Omoo* into German and later travelled to the South Pacific, where he gathered material for his own South Sea tales, which are almost forgotten today.

However, although there are still writers who, like Bab and Plischke, tend to underestimate Melville and the importance of *Moby Dick*,[35] the general reaction among contemporary German critics has been favorable. The articles which have appeared in recent years range from the superficial presentation in a popular illustrated weekly which heralds Melville as a "Hamlet of the Ocean"[36] to some highly perceptive discussions in literary and critical journals.[37] Because Melville has been a relatively unknown writer for most Germans, the majority of the articles provide general introductions to the man and his works. They rank *Moby Dick* high not only in American literature but also in world literature,[38] and Melville is linked with Shakespeare[39] and Homer.[40] He is lauded as one of the first writers to sense the impending collapse of the structure of the nineteenth century and to see the chaos behind the masks of middle-class convention.[41] *Moby Dick* is praised because, like the works of Ernst Jünger and Franz Kafka, it fulfills a deep metaphysical need for men living in a world wracked by two world wars.[42]

Ahab's struggle with the white whale is interpreted variously as man's striving for the infinite,[43] an insolvable riddle,[44] man's search

[33] J. Bab, *Amerikas Dichter* (Berlin, 1949), p. 49.

[34] H. Plischke, *Von Cooper bis Karl May* (Düsseldorf, 1951), p. 142.

[35] Plischke's comment on *Moby Dick* is interesting both for its brevity and for its lack of insight. "In his novel *Moby Dick* (1851) he [Melville] succeeded in setting up a pithy monument to whaling and the hunt for a particularly stately whale, the white-humped Moby Dick" (*ibid.*, 142-143).

[36] I. Lissner, "Herman Melville, der Hamlet der Ozeane," *Kristal*, V, No. 14 (1950), 12-13.

[37] F. Q. Arnold, "Das Werk Herman Melvilles oder der dichterischen Mythos," *Thema*, VII (1950); A. Janner, "Herman Melville—Gedanken zu *Moby Dick*," *Schweizer Annalen*, III (1946-47); C. Hohoff, *loc. cit.*; E. Vietta, *loc. cit.*

[38] H. G. Oliass, *loc. cit.*, p. 221; E. Vietta, *loc. cit.*, p. 641; C. Hohoff, *loc. cit.*, p. 245.

[39] F. Q. Arnold, *loc. cit.*, p. 26.

[40] C. Hohoff, *loc. cit.*, p. 245.

[41] G. Engels, *loc. cit.*, p. 167.

[42] F. Q. Arnold, *loc. cit.*, pp. 24-25.

[43] C. Hohoff, *loc. cit.*, p. 244.

[44] H. G. Oliass, *loc. cit.*, p. 223.

for truth,[45] his struggle for salvation by fighting evil,[46] his battle with fear,[47] and a theodicy in the Leibnitzian sense.[48] In Ahab, Melville created a figure somewhat similar to one of the great symbolic characters in German literature, Faust. For Ahab, however, there was no prospect of salvation; the demonic in him which drove him on the impossible chase after the white whale brought about his destruction and the annihilation of his world, i.e., his ship. The white monster cannot be destroyed; it disappears into the depths from which it came and there it lurks always ready and able to return; when a man measures himself against this force the result is cataclysmic for him and for all those associated with him.

It is perhaps no accident that the three works by Melville which have attracted the most attention in Germany are works concerned with prisoners. Billy Budd is forcibly taken from his ship, "The Rights of Man," to a warship, and there becomes a real prisoner who is guilty of murder and is executed. In *Benito Cereno*, the Spanish captain becomes a prisoner of the slaves on his own slave ship. In *Moby Dick*, the crew of the Pequod are not prisoners in the same sense as Billy Budd and Benito Cereno, but they are still bound to a ship from which they have no chance to escape. They have no control over their own lives and, when Ahab goes to his death, all except Ishmael are dragged to destruction as a result of the actions of their captain. These works have a particularly pregnant message for the Germans, who have seen so much chaos during the last half century.

The continued interest in Melville in Germany since the war is intense enough that one publisher has announced plans to publish his complete works in German.[49] The attention given Melville in academic circles is apparent from the number of dissertations on him.[50] When H. G. Scheffauer predicted in 1927 that *Moby Dick* would speak clearly and urgently to the German spirit, he was prophetic. The reputation of the work in Germany is now firmly established; *Moby Dick* is finally recognized as a great work of art.

Northwestern University

---

45 E. Vietta, *loc. cit.*, p. 645.
46 G. Engels, *loc. cit.*, p. 167.
47 H. Pongs, *Im Umbruch der Zeit* (Göttingen, 1952), p. 140.
48 M. Bense, *Literaturmetaphysik* (Stuttgart, 1950), pp. 71 f.
49 R. Andersch, *loc. cit.*, p. 382.
50 *Die Kurzgeschichte im Werk Herman Melvilles* (Frankfurt am Main); *Die Funktion des Erzählers in Melvilles Moby Dick* (Mainz); *The Development of Herman Melville's Pessimism* (Vienna); *Melville als Mystiker* (Vienna); *Der Einfluß und die Aufnahme Herman Melvilles in der deutschen und französischen Literatur* (Free University of Berlin). Information on these dissertations is incomplete; the titles are taken for the most part from publications issued by English seminars, which do not include information on the status of the works or the names of the authors.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE POETRY OF EXPERIENCE: THE DRAMATIC MONOLOGUE IN MODERN LITERARY TRADITION. By Robert Langbaum. New York: Random House, 1957. 246 p.

This book proposes that the most recent fissure in the landscape of English verse is that which separates the poetry of the nineteenth century from the poetry of the Enlightenment—with the romantics came a revolution in poetry which extends into the present day. To value the romantics so highly suggests that contemporary poets and critics (Eliot, Pound, F. R. Leavis in *New Bearings*) are in error. The established view is that the most recent significant change in English poetry came sometime after the turn of the present century. If the central thesis of this book is valid, the poetry of the romantics might be saved from current anti-romantic charges; furthermore, the reputations of the poets of the nineteenth century, especially Browning, might be restored. If established, this reinterpretation of the last hundred and seventy-five years of English poetry could be of great historical importance to literary criticism—especially so since the author is a young scholar who suggests in a footnote (p. 37) that he represents a "now emerging literary generation."

About romantic poetry Langbaum says: "the essential idea [is] ... the doctrine of experience" which holds that "immediate experience is primary and certain ... whereas the analytic reflection that follows is secondary and problematical. The poetry of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries can thus be seen in [this] connection as a poetry of experience constructed upon the deliberate disequilibrium between experience and idea." Poetry of experience, apparently, is relativistic and empirical. This kind of poetry was functional for the romantic poets. Unlike the Augustans, the romantics had no mutually held view of the world. Out of this "disequilibrium" of the romantic poets came a new "moral and aesthetic symmetry."

Romantic practice evolved the dramatic monologue, which was capable of transmitting this relativistic world view. This form is the important link between the poetry of Wordsworth, Browning, and Eliot—between the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The dramatic monologue is important because it allows the poet to render "extraordinary moral positions" and "extraordinary points of view"; it is also important because the flexibility of the form allows the reader great latitude in making moral judgments, for the poem's protagonists must always be seen in the light of our sympathy, as tempered by our predispositions in the "case."

In an admirable, energetic way the book ranges over an "impressive canon of 'modern' classics"—Locke, Coleridge, Eliot, and many others. The chapters on "Dramatic Lyric and Lyric Drama" and on "The Dramatic Monologue" set forth the central thesis of the book; the chapter on "The Ring and the Book: A Relativistic Poem" demonstrates considerable strength in close analysis; subsequent chapters treat the shorter dramatic monologues of Wordsworth, Tennyson, Yeats, and (for contrast) Pope's "Eloise and Abelard." A chapter on "Character Versus Action in Shakespeare" is shown to be germane, and claims to offer "light ... on the difference between the mind of Europe before and after the Enlightenment." In conclusion, there is a discussion of the implication of Aristotle's thought for the "high literature of modern times."

This is neither a dull book nor an unexciting thesis. Overall, the tone is mildly polemical and the argument often proceeds by massive generalization. The style, however, is sometimes burdened with such things as: "While the position they

[twentieth-century traditionalists] arrive at, no matter what it is, even if it includes the rejection of the romantic route by which they arrive at it, remains within the romantic tradition as long as it has been chosen."

There are at least three areas of weakness which must be cited. Centrally, was the end of the Enlightenment and the beginning of romanticism the last significant break in English poetry? At that moment, the book suggests, "the thing which ... happened was ... Newton, Locke, and the Enlightenment. Thought and emotion were no longer complementary." It is equally evident that something similar, but of a different order, happened in the late nineteenth century—Darwin, Marx, Freud, modern science, and later, the Marne. Because the dramatic monologue was one of the forms reoccuring in the work of the romantic and the modern poets, it does not follow that a "tradition" necessarily remains intact. Similar metrical patterns or identical narrative structures in themselves do not insure any significant "tradition." To take the dramatic monologue as an example—in this genre there is considerable difference in quality between the poems of Browning and the poems of Eliot. Eliot is subtle; Browning seldom is; and this difference must be attributed to Eliot's knowledge of another kind of world, one which Browning could never know. Precisely because the Victorian poets were too often dreamers of the unsubtle dream, they are not useful to the best contemporary poets, save in the example of sheer athletic prowess of Victorian metrical skills.

Were the romantics, in fact, the first to exploit the "poetry of experience"? True, the phrase is used in a somewhat technical sense in this book; at one level, however, "poetry of experience" remains a tautology. Pope surely thought he wrote from experience; he used his grotto at Twickenham for the express purpose of meditating upon that experience, whatever *kind* of experience it may have been. The Elizabethans, however, come more readily to mind. Any other concept than "poetry of experience" would have baffled Spenser (I should guess) and any other concept than "poetry of experience" certainly would have seemed a contradiction to Donne. Nor is there much help in the term "disequilibrium." At bottom this seems only another version of Eliot's troublesome concept of "dissociation of sensibility." If the two terms mean about the same thing, what gain is there to state that our recovery from the alleged "dissociation" began with the romantic (instead of with Pound or Eliot himself), when Eliot's concept is without much relevance in the first place?

Finally, the thesis of this book too much governs the literary judgments. The rigid basic assumptions become a substitute for criticism. *The Ring and the Book* is unquestionably a kind of Victorian masterpiece; it is also redundant, muscular, and unread. Modern poets do not write this kind of poetry, for good reason—melodramatic characterizations of good and evil, in our time, are not handled by poetry, and indeed too seldom by theology. For this kind of entertainment one goes to the movies. As another kind of example, "Eloise and Abelard" is discussed at length and is shown to be only a "soliloquy" and not a dramatic monologue, though with some revisions the poem might have qualified. Such discussion seems irrelevant; that poem is clearly a failure on other, more obvious, grounds. The Shakespeare chapter simply offers nothing new.

What purported to be a new thesis, and a new definition of a significant modern tradition, becomes only an application of some currently acceptable, some outmoded, critical ideas. The book is "conservative," for it attempts to "conserve" the reputations of the romantics and the Victorians. Kathleen Nott in *The Emperor's New Clothes* has called the writers of such books "neo-scholastics," and among others she names Eliot, Graham Greene, C. S. Lewis, and Basil Willey. The reasons for being "conservative," and the possible function of a conservative critic in the face of the present literary situation in America, always escape me.

No one should be surprised that a trade publisher issued this book as "a major contribution." This author's conservative attitudes and the general modish concern for "tradition" protects the publisher's own stake in the literary reputations of all the Tennysons and the Brownings, the best with the worst. If all is preserved, without distinction, then criticism will no longer be necessary. I am told this book was once a Ph.D. thesis; if so, it signifies, among other things, how difficult it is for an ambitious, interesting, alert mind to free itself from the dogma of the men who brought that interesting mind into a state resembling—no doubt—their own.

J. B. HALL

University of Oregon

THE FLAMING HEART: ESSAYS ON CRASHAW, MACHIAVELLI, AND OTHER STUDIES IN THE RELATIONS BETWEEN ITALIAN AND ENGLISH LITERATURE FROM CHAUCER TO T. S. ELIOT. By Mario Praz. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1958. x, 390 p.

Doubleday was happily inspired to bring out as a convenient paperback this collection of eleven important studies by Professor Mario Praz. All but one had appeared earlier, some in English and some in Italian; students of English literature will be grateful to have them all in English in a single volume.

The Introduction is not the least important of the essays; it bears the subtitle, "Literary Relations between Italy and England from Chaucer to the Present," and sketches compactly and expertly the best survey of the subject to be found anywhere. It first appeared in a somewhat longer form in Vol. IV (devoted to comparative literature) of *Problemi ed orientamenti critici di lingua e di letteratura italiana*, published in 1948 under the general editorship of A. Momigliano.

"Chaucer and the Great Italian Writers of the Trecento" was first published in *The Monthly Criterion* in 1927. In republishing this useful essay Professor Praz has taken into account (particularly in his footnotes) the pertinent scholarship of the last thirty years and has brought up to date the bibliographical appendix. This new edition of an old article is the most up-to-date study on the subject. Other older essays that reappear in this volume have been subjected to similar revision; henceforth scholars should consult these newer, more comprehensive versions.

"The Politic Brain: Machiavelli and the Elizabethans" traces the popular legend of Machiavelli from its origin in France at the time of Catherine de' Medici through various Scots writers (before Gentillet), Spenser, Sidney, Greville, Bacon, Harrington, etc. (with full acknowledgment to Ribner, Orsini, Armstrong, and other scholars) to the dramatists, who were chiefly responsible for giving it wide currency. Here Professor Praz stresses one of the vital points in the complex of influences that were shaping Elizabethan drama; the popularity of the Senecan villain encouraged the adoption of the Machiavellian type of knave—and for the very good reason that the Senecan villain first reached England in a form that had been elaborated and developed by G. B. Giraldi Cinthio with the help of elements derived from Machiavelli.

In "Shakespeare's Italy" Professor Praz dismisses various forms of the theory that Shakespeare must have traveled in Italy or known Italian well in order to create the Italian local color and use the Italian phrases that occur in many of the plays. The current handbooks for the study of Italian were amply sufficient to permit a gentleman or gentlewoman of the day to give the impression of a good acquaintance with Italian—especially John Florio's two volumes on *Fruites* and the two editions of his famous dictionary, *A Worlde of Wordes*. Shakespeare most

probably made use of Florio's volumes. And so did Ben Jonson ("Ben Jonson's Italy"), who inscribed a copy of *Volpone* "To his loving Father, & worthy Freind Mr. John Florio: The ayde of his Muses."

"Donne's Relation to the Poetry of his Time" defines Donne's place in the sensuous Petrarchan tradition, as well as the dramatic and passionate accent and the nervous elasticity that make him so different from his fellows, and brings out the remarkable similarity in tone of his holy sonnets to those of Michelangelo, which he could not have known. "But in his peculiar mixture of realism and platonism, in the dramatic turn of his genius as well as in his laborious yearnings for beauty and religion, in that double character of half-baffled, half-triumphant struggle, in his power of depicting the horrors of sin and death, and the terrible effects of the wrath of God, Donne is perhaps nearer to Michelangelo than to anybody else" (p. 202).

The essay from which the collection derives its title, "The Flaming Heart: Richard Crashaw and the Baroque," is abstracted from a portion of Professor Praz's well-known volume, *Secentismo e marinismo in Inghilterra* (1925). Its sixty pages survey the outstanding traits of the baroque period and brilliantly analyze a number of Crashaw's poems in their relation to the large contemporary output of Latin and Italian poems of *Argutezza* and epigrammatic expression, bold imagery, and luxuriance of color. Crashaw vies with Rubens "in sumptuousness and triumphal pomp: both sound the most high-pitched notes of the Heroic Catholicism born out of the Council of Trent" (p. 254). "In the whole course of seventeenth-century literature there is no higher expression of that spiritualisation of sense which is condensed [in the 'Hymn to Saint Teresa'] in a portentous, dizzy soaring of red-hot images."

"Petrarch in England" appears here for the first time in any form. It sums up Chaucer's slight indebtedness to Petrarch and passes to the Renaissance sonneteers, to whom Petrarch appealed "with an intensity unparallelled by any other foreign poet." The basic structure of the Italian sonnet—a first part with an even number of constituents, a second part with an odd number (the poem was set to music and the tune changed in the second part)—was thoroughly misunderstood both in England and in France, where the tercets were usually reduced to a quatrain plus a couplet and a couplet plus a quatrain, respectively. From its beginnings the sonnet showed a tendency to gravitate toward the second part and to conclude with a conceit. The beginning and the end of the sixteenth century witnessed flamboyant periods in its history, separated by twenty years or more of Bembist reaction. Wyatt and Surrey introduced the sonnet into England under the influence of the early flamboyant school (Serafino). Their followers in the sonnet form appeared only at the end of the century and were primarily influenced by French sonneteers, who were largely dominated by the later flamboyant school of Italian Petrarchists. Petrarch was not often imitated directly. "To find something similar to the *Canzoniere* in intensity and seriousness we must turn to Shakespeare... Nothing like this unity of inspiration do we experience while reading other Elizabethan sonnet sequences... None of these sonnets can be shown to derive directly from a Continental source. This fact is almost unique in Elizabethan literature... Continental themes reached him always filtered through a native medium" (pp. 278-279). Only John Donne among Shakespeare's contemporaries is more free from Petrarchan convention. After a period of neglect the sonnet was revived in England by Milton, who did not follow the Elizabethans but went directly to the Italians for the form of the poem, thus setting an example for later poets (p. 282).

"Ariosto in England" begins, in order to make a contrast, with a brief sketch of Ariosto's considerable fortune in France (Cioranescu's basic study is not mentioned), due in part to the close intellectual and diplomatic ties with Ferrara. He

became known in England more slowly, and seems to have been read less for the voluptuous and musical poetry that appealed to the French than for the moral tales and the alleged allegory of the whole. Spenser's novelty "consisted in presenting the romantic epic in an allegorical garb." But Professor Praz makes the claim, in a few delightful and persuasive pages, that the one English work that shows a greater spiritual affinity with the *Orlando furioso* than the *Faerie Queene* is *Midsummer Night's Dream*. "Ariosto's world was, in its very essence, alien to Spenser, but Shakespeare . . . could seize the spirit of Ariosto's poem."

It was through Spenser's imitations in the *Faerie Queene* that Tasso first really penetrated into English literature, with an "accent of voluptuous enchantment and elegiac peace, a languorous and suave perfection" ("Tasso in England," p. 309) in the Bower of Bliss. He introduced the motif of innocent pastoral life contrasted with the corruption of courts—a motif taken up in *As You Like It* ("Now, my co-mates, and brothers in exile"). Cowley's *Davideis* owes a large debt to the *Gerusalemme liberata*. Milton took over Tasso's precepts of heroic poetry; they may be illustrated much more readily in *Paradise Lost* than from Tasso's own compositions (p. 325). There is one substantial passage in the *Torrismondo* which Professor Praz suggests may actually be the model for the meter of *Paradise Lost* (pp. 325-330). He also remarks, "one has heard much about the Spenserian character of *Comus*, but nobody seems to have been aware that Tasso's *Aminta* is his real model." Professor Praz appraises the various English translations of Tasso's epic, rapidly traces the curve of Tasso imitation in England, and concludes his meaty article with an account of a curious brief modern poem by Norman Nicholson, *Millom Delivered*, in which Tasso appears "to the eyes of a poet of our age of Anxiety, in the unusual garb of the singer of a waste land."

The final essay in the book is a revised and enlarged version of "T. S. Eliot and Dante" which first appeared in the *Southern Review* (1937). It stresses Eliot's great debt to Pound's *The Spirit of Romance* for the appreciation of Dante. Professor Praz finds in Pound's idea of poetry as "a sort of inspired mathematics . . . equations for the human emotions" the starting point of Eliot's theory of the "objective correlative." The central portion of the essay, which remains approximately as it first appeared, illustrates Eliot's use of Dantesque devices and images. The final pages, which are new, comment upon the second section of *Little Gidding*, "Eliot's most sustained effort in imitating Dante," and add some precise reminiscences to those traced by Raymond Preston. It is a pity that Eliot's own remarks in the *Kenyon Review* (XIV, 1952, 178-188) are not commented upon here.

The few points that I have selected can give no adequate idea of the wealth of information and insights contained in this stimulating volume, or of the overall unity and cohesion which the collection possesses. From Chaucer to the present, to quote from the cover, "we follow the sense of Italy and Italian thought and imagination which has directed and enlivened the works of major English authors." It should be on the desk of all students of English literature.

CHANDLER B. BEALL

University of Oregon

LE DANDYSME EN FRANCE (1817-1839). By John C. Prevost. Geneva: E. Droz; Paris: Minard, 1957. 215 p.

Professor Prevost's *Le dandysme en France (1817-1839)* is concerned with much of the material also used by Jacques Boulenger in his witty and excellent book, *Sous Louis-Philippe. Les dandys* (1932); but the present volume is quite different from its predecessor in organization and tone and is concerned primarily

not with individual dandies but with the more difficult subject of dandyism itself.

The first five chapters treat the period from 1800 to 1830—the background and development of English dandyism, its flourishing with Brummell and its relation to Lord Byron (who is described as no true dandy), the dandy in English letters, and English influence in France. Chapter VI traces an evolution of types ("Du petit-maître au fashionable"). The central chapter is on "Le dandy"; and the last six chapters are concerned with French judgments of Brummell and Byron, "Le dandysme," the dandy and French literature, the dandy of Stendhal, the dandy of Balzac, and literary dandyism. The book ends with a conclusion, nine appendixes of considerable interest, a ten-page bibliography, and fourteen pages of valuable lists and indexes (with separate listings and page references for cited authors, works, journals, and reviews; "espèces d'élégants"; fashionable cafés, clubs, restaurants, theaters, etc.; and pertinent characters in novels, plays, and the like).

Professor Prevost points out the difficulty of finding a satisfactory definition of the dandy, and his book reflects its author's apparent lack of assurance in this matter. The problem is complicated by the fact that he deals with at least two rather different conceptions of the term *dandysme* (as intended by itself and as intended in the phrase *dandysme littéraire*).

The elegant Brummell (*simplex munditiis*) was "the mighty genius" of the English dandies, who introduced starch into neckcloths and shook the fashionable world. Byron is cited as using the word "dandy" for the first time (in 1813) to designate a beau of the Regency, in particular, the four principal dandies of the day: Brummell, Mildmay, Alvanley, and Pierrepont, all of them close to Brummell's "fat friend," the Prince of Wales. Brummell's flight from his creditors to France in 1816 is seen as possibly ending the most important period in the development of British dandyism.[1]

Professor Prevost sees the dandy's definitive entrance into English letters in a verse of Byron's *Beppo* (1818) and mentions, among the most famous of the fashionable English novels mirroring the dandy's world, Ward's *Tremaine* (1825), Disraeli's *Vivian Grey* (1827), and Lytton's *Pelham* (1828). In the portrait of *Pelham* the dandy Lord Russelton was inspired by Brummell.

In France varieties of the dandy family can be traced at least from the age of Louis XIV.[2] Professor Prevost cites the *petits-maîtres*, who flourished from the late 1600s; the elegant *roués-mondains* of the eighteenth century, of whom Valmont in *Les liaisons dangereuses* is the most notable literary example; the *muscadins* of the Revolutionary period with their characteristic insolence, brutality, and scorn of the crowd; the *incroyables* at the time of the Directory, who took their name from a habit of repeating "C'est incroyable" (pronounced without the *r*); the *merveilleux*; and, after Waterloo, the *fashionables*, who affected English habits, had grooms for valets and djakys for coachmen, ate roast beef and pudding, drank tea, porter, and Jamaica rum, and imported all their toilet articles from London.

According to Professor Prevost, French *dandysme* drew inspiration more from the cynical skepticism and dissipation of Lord Byron than from the elegant dress and social example of Brummell, and thus effaced the distinction generally made by the English between *dandysme* and *rouerie*. Dandyism in England is here described as primarily *fatuité exclusive*, characterized by coldness and reserve, whereas French *dandysme* is seen as involving a whole way of life.

---

[1] The fall of "the dowager dandy" from the heights has been called "in its way as great a fall as Napoleon's."

[2] Chateaubriand (*Mémoires d'outre-tombe*, nouv. éd. par Edmond Biré, IV, 246-247) finds "l'original du dandy" in the *mignons* of Henry III.

In France there developed in connection with *dandysme* an ideal of impassivity and *sang-froid*, along with a cult of the self that paralleled the ideal of *l'art pour l'art* in the culture of the age. One may wonder whether the dandy's cult was not to some extent a protest against the insistence on utilitarian aims in life and against that rising mediocrity and materialism in French society, of one of whose champions Baudelaire was to write scornfully at a later date: "Saint-Marc Girardin a dit un mot qui restera: 'Soyons médiocres!'" Amidst the hue and cry for *l'art utile*, there is an appealing vitality in Captain Gronow's description of le comte d'Orsay, one of the most brilliant dandies of the day: "When I used to see him driving in his tilbury... I fancied that he looked like some gorgeous dragon-fly skimming through the air; and though all was dazzling and showy, yet there was a kind of harmony which precluded any idea of accusation of bad taste."

Aside from le comte d'Orsay, Professor Prevost cites among the significant Parisian dandies such figures as Lord Henry Seymour, le comte Demidoff, Charles Laffitte, M. de Normandie, le prince de la Moskowa, le comte d'Alton-Shée, Roger de Beauvoir, le prince Belgiojoso, Alfred Tattet, and le comte de Montrond. Dandies who were members frequented the Jockey Club. Among their other most popular places of assembly were the Café Tortoni, restaurants like Le Rocher de Cancale, Les Trois Frères Provençaux, and Beauvilliers, and such *salons* as those of Mme de Boscari de Villeplaine and la comtesse de Merlin. Not many literary men moved in this world. Eugène Sue and Roger de Beauvoir were among the few writers belonging to the Jockey Club, whose members blackballed Alfred de Musset.

The dandy first made his way into French literature as an incomplete figure in the early 1830s with Mérimée (*Le vase étrusque* and *La double méprise*) and Stendhal (*Le Rouge et le Noir*)—then, more completely, in the works of Balzac from 1836 to 1840. Professor Prevost maintains that Balzac falsified chronology by presenting dandies before their time, during the Restoration in 1819,[3] and failed to make one *see* the milieu in which his dandies moved. Yet Balzac created the most famous dandies in French literature, with such characters as Marsay, Trailles, and Rastignac.

The last and longest chapter in *Le dandysme en France* is concerned with "Le dandysme littéraire"; and this chapter throws the book somewhat out of focus, since literary dandyism is described as something other than simple *dandysme*. The rudiments of the concept of literary dandyism are taken from Hazlitt's analysis (in 1824) of Byron's dandyism in *Don Juan*, as exemplified in such lines as the following:

> "I say—the future is a serious matter—
> And so—for God's sake—hock and soda water!"

Professor Prevost notes the juxtaposition of the *style noble* and the *style comique*, with its cynicial confusion of serious relationships. He also accepts a further definition of French *dandysme littéraire* given by H. C. de Saint-Michel in 1832, which stresses mockery, superficial analysis of passions and characters, wealthy heroes and *héroïnes coquettes*, cynicism, incredulity, crudity, frivolous tone, and a careless attitude toward the art of writing.

Stendhal's epigraph for *Le Rouge et le Noir* ("To the happy few") is seen as an example of *dandysme littéraire*. So is his pretended carelessness toward his work ("J'écris comme on fume un cigare, pour passer le temps"). The episode in the church in which Julien Sorel finds the fragment of paper referring to the

[3] According to Professor Prevost, there was no notable dandyism in France before 1830; the phenomenon, he believes, is characteristic of the age of Louis-Philippe.

FEB 5 1959

execution of Louis Jenrel (an anagram of his name) is considered a probable "mystification de dandy."[4] Even the title of *Le Rouge et le Noir* is found to indicate Stendahl's desire to make fun of his public ("Sur le chantier le roman s'appelait *Julien*").

Mérimée's mystifications in *Le théâtre de Clara Gazul* and *La Guzla* and his cavalier denouement in the *Chronique du règne de Charles IX* are considered further examples of *dandysme littéraire*. Thereafter, Professor Provost himself engages in a sort of *dandysme critique* when he leaves it to the reader to decide whether the end of Alfred de Musset's "Ballade à la lune" is pertinent to his discussion. The works of Paul de Musset are called "the most striking examples of literary dandyism," but appear upon examination to be empty trivia. Other examples are seen in Gautier (*Albertus, Les Jeunes-France*), Eugène Sue, and Roger de Beauvoir.

Finally, Professor Prevost sees a new conception of *dandysme* evolving from the members of the Petit Cénacle and Théophile Gautier about 1832; and he cites a poem of Théophile Dondey called "Dandysme" (from *Feu et flamme* [1833], which stresses artistic revery and taste for form, colors, and sensation. This artistic *dandysme* (Gautier's "épanouissement de l'âme dans l'oisiveté") is seen in the background of the later ideals of Baudelaire, Barbey d'Aurevilly, Huysmans, and Bourget.

Le dandysme en France (1817-1839) is a book full of interesting matter; but it suffers from its author's indecision as to precisely what he is doing and from his failure to establish clear definitions. Much of the material on the English dandies has been treated before; and one wonders whether they deserve the attention they get in this book, in view of the slight influence they seem to have exerted. The concept of *dandysme littéraire* is of great interest, and we need a term for reference to the significant phenomenon considered under this heading; but the concept may need to be distinguished more clearly from exaggerated trifling of the sort practiced by the Jeunes-France.

One aspect of dandyism seems to the present reviewer to have been insufficiently stressed. Professor Prevost cites in passing the brutality of the *muscadins* during the Revolution and that of certain later dandies; but there is an apparent inhumanity (arising from egotism, insentience, or cruelty) that deserves more central consideration as part of *dandysme* in France, especially as it develops in literature. This is evident, for example, at the end of Mérimée's *Le vase étrusque* in the recounting of the hero's death; in the cold ferocity of de Marsay in *La fille aux yeux d'or*; and (a few years later) in the scene of *Les mystères de Paris* in which the elegant Rodolphe cuts out the eyes of the brutal schoolmaster. Professor Prevost cites without comment (p. 175) an example of this sort of thing from the world of the English dandies ("Examination of a Young Pretender to Fashion," *London Magazine*, May 1825, pp. 46-48):

"Q. Supposing a woman of fashion sets you down in her carriage, what is the established etiquette?

A. To be rude.

Q. How do you make love to a chambermaid at an inn?

A. I knock her down with the bootjack."

There is an elusive quality in dandyism, something of tone and manner that is hard to define. Perhaps a touch of the superior dandy's elegance and wit is needed to provide the proper accent for the treatment of so remarkable and persistent an

[4] For a very different interpretation, see E. B. O. Borgerhoff's note in *MLN*, LXVIII (1953), 383-386.

element in urbane circles of the human comedy. Professor Prevost's study is primarily historical and factual. It seems to lack an overall informing and shaping point of view. But it contains information of much interest and value for the student of modern literature and modern society.

ALFRED G. ENGSTROM

University of North Carolina

RAINER MARIA RILKE. LETTRES MILANAISES, 1921-1926. Introduction et textes de liaison par Renée Lang. Paris: Plon, 1956. xviii, 123 p.

Professor Lang has called the letters Rilke wrote between 1921 and 1926 to the young duchess Gallarati Scotti *Lettres milanaises* because Milan was the great lady's home town. Extreme modesty, and perhaps also the wish not to be mistaken for one of Rilke's numerous feminine conquests, caused the duchess to refuse publication of these letters for more than thirty years. When, in 1954, Renée Lang discovered them on a microfilm in the Rilke Archives in Bern, Switzerland, and prevailed upon the duchess to grant permission to publish them, a title was found that conveyed her wish to remain in the background.

In the preface and in her enlightening "textes de liaison," Renée Lang analyzes the role that France and Italy played in Rilke's development. Complementing each other, both countries seem to have been necessary to him. France gave him what German critics call *Bildungserlebnisse*, from the early days of discipleship under Rodin to the years of his maturity, when he chose Valéry as his master of intellectual discipline. Italy was to the homeless wanderer an intermittent refuge, spiritual as well as material.

While almost every page in the *Lettres milanaises* shows the part that Italy played in Rilke's life and work, France never ceases to have a major place in his thought and occupations. Through his own reports and Renée Lang's commentaries we learn of his numerous French readings: Gide, Proust, Giraudoux, Cocteau, Maurois, Montherlant, Roger Martin du Gard, and, above all, Valéry, whose "Cimetière marin" he translated in February 1921. By placing Rilke's capital poems in the neighborhood of Valéry, pointing out that the Valéry translations appeared immediately before and after Rilke's greatest poetic effort, the *Sonnets to Orpheus* and the *Duino Elegies*, Professor Lang reaches a significant conclusion—transposing Valéry triggered Rilke's productivity into a new, strong personal outburst.

There is a profusion of interesting material in the *Lettres milanaises*—a significant characterization of Gide, his paradoxical but sound analysis of the *Nourritures terrestres*, his reminiscences of Duse and the Pitoëffs, his evocation of Viareggio and Rome. These subjects, are, however, not the source of the controversy which this book has aroused in Europe. There is a much more sensational news value in the *Lettres milanaises*—Rilke's enthusiasm for rising Fascism, his admiration for Mussolini, "creator of a new Italian conscience," under whom Italian youth could unite in "proud and voluntary obedience," his mystic yearning for another, higher kind of freedom that would not limit the human soul, his outspoken criticism of Germany as a political entity, his condemnation of the "sudden unification of the small, more or less sleepy *Länder* under the . . . arrogant domination of Prussia" which obliterated true German characteristics, and his apology for violence (pp. 94 ff.). All this is most puzzling.

What could have caused the *doctor serafico*, the gentle humanist, to espouse the cause of Fascism in 1926? There may be a number of factors involved. Very judiciously, Reneé Lang reminds us of his extreme *perméabilité*; the arguments

marshalled in favor of Fascism are indeed reminiscent of the opinions of some of his Parisian friends, both Frenchmen and White Russians, and even at times of the man in the street. Then there is his illness; Rilke himself offers an explanation which we may do well to accept:

"Est-ce que c'est parce que je suis malade moi-même que je préconise l'emploi du régime, du remède, qui comporte toujours l'autorité, une certaine violence temporaire et une privation de liberté?"

Only a few of the political themes touched on in these letters reflect the poet's intensely personal thinking: the sanctity of tradition, e.g., the high value of the handmade object as contrasted with that of the shallow, ugly machine product, and the romantic glow cast over the Middle Ages, which to Rilke is the epoch of patriarchalism, genuineness, in short, true happiness. We recognize the themes; but in these letters he seems to enter new paths. His eulogy of dictatorship, his reflections on the origin of nations, and, above all, his self-portrait—that of a man without a country—appear to this reviewer deserving of a more detailed analysis.

The addressee of these letters emerges from this correspondence as a true Italian noblewoman. She opposed Rilke's political convictions with a quiet dignity: "Non, mon cher Rilke, je ne suis pas une admiratrice de M. Mussolini. Je déteste la violence et je la supporte encore moins quand elle agit en ma faveur ou en faveur de ma classe sociale que si elle est adoptée par mes ennemis." The editor praises her "exquises qualités de gentillesse, de sincérité modeste, de dignité respectueuse et de gracieuse fermeté quand il s'agit de choses essentielles."

Instead of footnotes or commentary, substantial and informative texts connect the letters. This method gives the reader a scholarly, well-documented study that reads like a novel.

GEORGETTE SCHULER

Morris Harvey College

FRANZ KAFKA TODAY. Edited by Angel Flores and Homer Swander. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1958. viii, 290 p.

A great deal has been written on the works of Frank Kafka in the last twenty years or so, as anyone who glances through the carefully prepared bibliographies in the fourth section of *Franz Kafka Today* will immediately realize. Mr. Flores and Mr. Swander have selected from among all these writings those that they consider best interpret the more important short stories and the novels, diaries, and letters, and have collected them in a symposium expressive of the way in which this great Austrian novelist is seen in our time.

The editors wisely begin their book with essays on the germinal short stories. In the first essay Mrs. Flores deals with "The Judgment," attempting to set a middle course between Herbert Trauber's religio-symbolic interpretations of the work and Claude-Edmonde Magny's literal reading. We are not too surprised to learn that what is obscured by one and practically ignored by the other is an obsessive father image through which Kafka looks for love and guidance, for law and certainty. F. D. Luke confirms the importance of this fixation in discussing "The Metamorphosis," which is for him a punishment phantasy associated with an extremely primitive father image. He also refers to Kafka's murderous humor, to his tragic irony, and sees it arise from the physical metamorphosis as it gives form to the parable. Basil Busacca, analyzing "A Country Doctor," distinguishes between traditional fables, such as those of Aesop, and Kafka's allegories. The same problem is discussed by R. W. Stallman in his essay on "A

Hunger Artist." Stallman contrasts Kafka and Bunyan, pointing out that in Bunyan Faithful is always faithful and Envy always envious, while Kafka, who uses symbols rather than allegories, assigns multiple meanings to his realistic and fantastic details. For Carl R. Woodring, in his study of "Josephine the Singer, or the Mouse Folk," Kafka's fictions can be divided into perplexities, frustrations, affections or acceptances, and agonies, just as Hardy's can be called tragedies, romances, fantasies, and ingenuities. Clement Greenberg believes "The Great Wall of China" represents the fence of Jewish law, or Torah, but remarks that it also alludes to the entire human condition. Finally, Jurvis Thurston sees in "The Married Couple" a comic and satiric commentary on a world which, like man, moves from a sheltered childhood to an irresolute adulthood.

What we ultimately gather from this section can be perhaps summarized as follows: Kafka is an allegorical writer whose obliquity is nevertheless different from that of either Aesop or Bunyan, having more in common with that of Dante or the metaphysical poets. His symbols are not rigid, although through them certain subconscious obsessions bring out a particularly strong father image, and express a feeling of imprisonment in a world both aimless and irresolute.

The second section begins with Mark Spilka's essay on the genesis of *Amerika*. He reminds us that Kafka was thinking of settling in the United States around 1912 and that at that time there was awakened in him an interest in a land he never got to know. It was then that he read Franklin and Whitman, as well as the works of Dickens which deal with the United States. (The influence of Dickens on Kafka merits a detailed study which is not provided in this book, although Mr. Spilka hints at the influence when he remarks on the parallel between Dickens' Eden Land Corporation and Kafka's Nature Theatre of Oklahoma.) The meaning of *Amerika* is discussed by Lienhard Bergel, who points out that what to Whitman is a special distinction of the New World is for Kafka an unspeakable horror. Kafka's *Amerika*, he remarks, is *Leaves of Grass à rebours*. From both Spilka and Bergel we learn that Kafka's main reason for wanting to come to North America was a recurring dream of escape from his father, from his oppressive job in Prague, and from his inner torment.

The structure of *The Trial* is analyzed by Herman Uyttersprot. He believes that Kafka consciously aimed at chaos and confusion of elements to produce a kind of spell, and, with this in mind, purposely disarranged the chapters and destroyed the sequence. Mr. Uyttersprot eventually suggests a new arrangement for them. René Duavin studies the meaning of this novel, and remarks on the way in which the author's deep sense of sin and strong guilt complex affect the work. Nevertheless he finds *The Trial* full of messianic hope. "A fervent admirer of Goethe, Kafka always hoped for a life made possible by an ideal community that safeguarded the irrefutable rights of the individual."

The discussion of *The Castle* begins with Max Brod's well-known essay on the genesis of this novel, followed by Donald Pearce's parallel between *The Castle* and Dante's *Divine Comedy*. Mr. Pearce considers both works quests after an absolute and after salvation. He observes that salvation made relatively simple demands on Dante, for whom it was only necessary to believe in God to open up a bright path towards that goal; for Kafka the path to salvation was more complex, leading through the disharmony and uncertainty of our world. In Homer Swander's "The Castle, K's Village" the personal aspects of the allegory are more intimately discussed. K's journey to the village is seen as a renunciation of home, the orthodox community of men, for the purpose of carrying on a relentless, designedly lonely battle against powers of deep religious significance, which can only be challenged in the village. The subjective side of this work is stressed frequently in these essays; we are reminded that K represents Kafka's inner life.

The final section of the book concentrates on the novelist himself, through studies of the diaries and letters by Maurice Blanchot, Heinz Politzer, and Werner Vortriede.

This is a useful and important symposium. Nevertheless, it is not without its limitations. With few exceptions, the essays were not written especially for this book, and therefore frequently overlap, stressing again and again the very same points. Moreover, the fact that the editors have fixed as a standard of excellence a high degree of impersonal objectivity, not wishing to have anything to do with critics who appear to be grinding their own axes, has made for a certain coldness and uniformity of approach. One of the most important qualities of Kafka's work is not made sufficiently evident, and indeed does not lend itself to a detached approach—the ever-present oneirodynia or dream anguish. The magical chaos of which Mr. Uyttersprot speaks has about it a really powerful oneirologic.

There is an existential anguish in Kafka's writings; his vision of the world is much the same as Jasper's, who writes in *Man in the Modern Age*: "As compared with man in the past, man today has been uprooted, having become conscious that he exists in what is but a historically determined and changing situation. It is as if the foundations of being had been shattered. How self-evident to the man of old seemed the unity of life and knowledge has become plain to us now that we realize that the life of our fellows in the past was spent under conditions in which reality was, as it were, veiled. We, on the other hand, have become able to see things as they really are, and that is why the foundations of life quake beneath our feet . . . This movement, this flux, this process, sweeps us into the whirlpool of unceasing conquest and creation, of loss and gain, in which we painfully circle, subject in the main to the power of the current . . ." This whirlpool appears unceasing and drags us toward nowhere and nothing. Yet mankind multiplies enormously, increasingly complicating the functional processes of society, tangling the skein of human affairs, while we, caught in its knotted strands, become more intensely aware of our personal desolation. This was particularly true of Kafka, who, like all men of genius, was endowed with a deep capacity for experience.

But Kafka was also a neurasthenic, and dreamed a great deal. This means that he saw all the time, without relief. He lived, as the Spanish critic Amado Alonso has said of Pablo Neruda, with an eye horribly forced open as if by two ruthless, relentless fingers. His ability as an artist permitted him to communicate to the vision of reality contained in his novels the anxiety, and at times the panic, which overwhelm us in a nightmare. With him it is as if we had been listening to the beat of our heart at the temples shortly before falling asleep, and this beat had gone with us into a dream in which we watched the chest open to reveal the heart, alive, scarlet, humid, blindly sucking at the arteries like a strange and frightening complementary animal. Such a dream takes us into an experience we are not likely to have while awake; but, although we know this will never happen to us, we also know that it is *true*, that within us there is a heart acting just as we saw it in our dream, and that this dream took us into another sphere of reality. No essay on Kafka can claim, as the editors claim of those in this symposium, to allow his works to speak forcibly for themselves if they do not keep these sensations alive; for without them there is no Kafka. The meaning of Kafka lies primarily in the emotional states his works manage to induce. But then the editors may not quite mean what they say when they claim to be collecting essays that allow the works of art to speak forcibly for themselves. For surely no work of art can speak forcibly for itself outside itself.

Although the title of this book is *Franz Kafka Today*, only the works are discussed, and little or nothing is said concerning the extent to which Kafka is

symptomatic of our time. It is interesting to note that Kafka is the product of the decaying Hapsburg empire which, under Charles V and Phillip II, had been one of the greatest in history. He is therefore part of the same cultural world to which Rilke belonged, a poet who in life would keep a door open for death, and Italo Svevo (whose Trieste was once part of Austria), a novelist with a profound understanding of futility and aimlessness. In this world, too, psychoanalysis was born. It would seem that, as this world began to break apart, the artist was able to see the decaying interior through the wide cracks in its castle. To this same world, in a more vigorous period, Calderón belonged; he, too, was able to see life as a dream (*La vida es sueño*). One could quite easily make as interesting a parallel between *The Castle* and *Don Quixote* as Mr. Pearce has constructed for *The Castle* and *The Divine Comedy*. When one considers what has been happening all over the world in the last half century, one can understand why the art of this section of Europe has had such profound repercussions.

Mr. Flores and Mr. Swander have assembled an important group of essays on Kafka, many of which we would have read with far greater pleasure by themselves; for together they tend to neutralize each other. The book is a significant contribution, but not yet the book on Kafka we have been waiting for.

JORGE ELLIOTT

University of Chile

STYLE IN THE FRENCH NOVEL. By Stephen Ullmann. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957. vii, 272 p.

"Stylistic" studies, in the sense in which continental European and American scholars have used the term since approximately the year 1900, seem to be gaining vogue in England—which had, in this field, remained behind French and German and also Spanish and Italian scholarship. In 1953 we were given Dr. Sayce's book, *Style in French Prose*, in which the resources of expressivity in the French language were studied on the basis of passages excerpted from ten prose texts of eminent writers ranging over four centuries—ultimately an application of Bally's method which remains close to the general language, but devised by Mr. Sayce also for the purpose of characterizing individual styles of great writers. I have pointed out in *Critique* how far and why Dr. Sayce missed this latter goal.

Now Dr. Ullmann, while treating also French prose in general, attempts to do more justice to the personal style of writers by confining himself to the novel (twenty-four novels are studied) and to the nineteenth and twentieth centuries; but—and this is most important for him—he studies the style of the *complete* novels in question, not excerpts, as Sayce did. On the other hand, he remains somewhat close to Sayce in that he treats, not the whole of a writer's style, but certain stylistic devices which each author has in common with his contemporaries, so that the resources of expressivity in the French literary language are also studied. The general phenomena of modern prose writing are considered in a loosely historical (historical as to date of first appearance) and also systematic order (systematic from a linguistic point of view). Thus Ullmann treats romantic lexicological innovation in the usage of terms evoking "local colour," the syntactical devices of *style indirect libre* (developed, perhaps not first, but most extensively by Flaubert), of nominal sentences (discovered by the Goncourts), of inversions (particularly in Proust), and, finally, of imagery (which includes the synaesthesia of Proust).

Professor Ullmann, as the author of the *Précis de sémantique française*, is well known for his elegant and lucid style and his capacity for exposing intricate prob-

FEB 5 1960

lems in a manner accessible to the layman and at the same time enligthening for the scholar. He is always well informed about any matter he treats, courteous in the presentation of opinions with which he disagrees, and appreciative of what has been done by his predecessors; he is, moreover, skillful in pointing out the difficulties and contradictions that are implied in any particular choice of method. He strikes a fine balance between his own expository prose and the examples drawn from his writers in order to substantiate his own assertions. In addition to his linguistic expertness, he possesses a discriminating taste for literature and literary criticism, a rare combination of gifts that is indispensable for a work in which an attempt is made to bridge the gulf between linguistics and aesthetic intepretation. As a result, his book should prove interesting to professional linguists, critics, *littérateurs*, and laymen alike.

In a study that synthesizes the work of so many scholars spanning a half century, we cannot expect to find sensationally new discoveries about the devices used by writers such as Flaubert, the Goncourts, Proust, or even Sartre. Very often, however, new facets of their work are brought to light by Professor Ullmann's "new approach," which consists in examining works complete in themselves and in comparing them with other works (of the same or of other authors) so that we may evaluate the dosage of a particular device in a particular work or author and also establish the connection between this device and the purpose or meaning of the particular work. It is not irrelevant, for example, to follow the various avatars of the *style indirect libre* through the whole work of Flaubert and to ask oneself why *Madame Bovary* and *L'Éducation sentimentale* are overcrowded with this device whereas *Salammbô* is not. (The explanation given by our author, "neither the theme nor the narrative form were particularly suited to this type of reporting," however, seems to me somewhat tautological; I would suggest that, since *Salammbô* is not a novel about the elusiveness of psychological reality, Flaubert wished, here, to remain *impassible*.)

The objections that I might feel inclined to raise against Professor Ullmann's book are very few in number; indeed, they are rather warnings about what the reader should not expect to find. For example, the title might perhaps suggest that the five devices treated form a complete "stylistic system" (p. 259) on which the modern French novel would be based. Obviously this is not Professor Ullmann's assumption; otherwise he would have included many other narrative devices, such as the use of camera and cinema technique or the *monologue intérieur* ("stream of consciousness"); these are not discussed, nor is any treatment given (only a scant hint, p. 217) of the invasion of poetry into the novel (or of the scientific style). Indeed, the reader familiar with the English and American novelists of the last half century, who have brought into being so many stylistic innovations, may feel that, in comparison, the French novelistic devices treated in our book seem relatively timid or stale (and indeed Professor Ullmann takes care at the end of nearly each chapter to mention the possibility of obsolescence).

Another doubt has to do with the inclusion of imagery in a work on stylistics. As Mr. Ullmann himself has pointed out, metaphors and similes are not the "dress of thought," as Dr. Johnson believed, but, more than any other formal devices, belong to what Flaubert called "la chair même de la pensée." Thus the insect imagery in a novel by Sartre is part and parcel of the content of Sartre's thinking (cf. his play *Les Mouches*); and if, in V. Hugo's *Booz endormi*, Ruth, looking up to the starry sky, thinks in terms of her daily work (*moissonneur, faucille, champ*, p. 31), this belongs to her character (the indefatigable tiller of the soil who does not understand the "negligence" of the "moissonneur de l'éternel été") and to her destiny—as if God had made possible, by a casual miracle, at the height of the summer, the rejuvenation of Booz. (I do not quite understand why Professor Ullmann

lists this passage under the heading "choice of images drawn from the personal experience of the poet"—the image is Ruth's, not Hugo's).

In reading the chapter on imagery I have asked myself also whether Mr. Ullmann does not overevaluate the presence of images in a writer's work (even if the images are "functional," that is, adapted to and corresponding with the tenor of the work of fiction). Is Giono, who calls himself "accoucheur d'images" (as well as "cuisinier," "décorateur," "chimiste"), a truly great writer because of the easy recipe he has found for presenting any action whatsoever in rural similes? Such a procedure, with its ready-made quality, can, I admit, be very striking at first glance; I myself was led, thirty years ago, to an aesthetic overevaluation of the similes of Jules Romains' "unanimistic" novels—whose technique, incidentally, has left a certain imprint in Sartre's novels; cf. passages such as "l'azur pond des avions sur leurs têtes"; "des pensées velues, pattues courent partout, sautent d'une tête à l'autre," p. 251; "cette marche collective ... se mit à battre en elle comme un gros cœur forcé. Le cœur de tous" (p. 255). In such cases the philologist is apt to confuse the easy discernibility of a device with its aesthetic impact.

I can add very little to Mr. Ullmann's penetrating interpretations of particular passages:

Page 123. In cases where Flaubert presents, in *style indirect libre*, thoughts of Emma Bovary's, using expressions "she would never have thought of" (e.g., "des épithalames élégiaques"), I would use the term coined by the late Professor Auerbach: Flaubert has made Emma's probably hazy thoughts "sprachreif," accessible to language. *Style indirect libre* is always a clever writer's device in which he appears pseudo-objective (or, if one prefers, pseudosubjective).

Page 122 (nouns for adjectives). It is extremely interesting that Ullmann has found with the Goncourts the type *la blancheur d'une main* used particularly often with such conceptions as, precisely, *blancheur* ("Renée, disparaissait dans la vague blancheur de son peignoir"), *pâleur, transparence, nudité* (also *maigreur, pauvreté*). Since Ullmann gives no explanation of this preponderance I would suggest that the abstraction (*blancheur* instead of *blanc*) has presented itself most readily to those writers where it is truly an "abs-traction," a deprivation of the object of its concreteness, clarity, and contour (notice above "Renée disparaissait dans la *vague* blancheur").

Page 123. The type *un geste de tristesse*, although found with the Goncourts along with *la blancheur d'une main*, is to be sharply distinguished from the latter. Granting that in both cases a noun has been made to serve the purpose of an original adjective (=*geste triste*; =*main blanche*), still this new noun does not have the same hierarchical rank (or the same position) in the two phrases. In *geste de tristesse*, the noun *tristesse* continues the subordinate function of the adjective *triste*, while in *la blancheur d'une main*, the noun *blancheur* has become the central element of the phrase; here, and only here, do we have a reversal of roles: from "hand" limited by "white" to "whiteness" limited by "hand." Secondly, I am not even sure that *geste de tristesse* is best understood as a reworking of *geste triste*. Here the original noun (*geste*) represents a verbal concept, as *main* does not, and the subordinate *tristesse* has a causal (or resultative) relationship with the action implied (a relationship expressed, primarily, by nouns, not adjectives); in *un geste de tristesse* (*une expression d'horreur; un cri de terreur*) we have to do with an act performed because of, or in order to express, sadness, horror, terror. And what would be the "original adjectives" underlying *expression d'horreur, cri de terreur?* The secondary formations *horrifiée, terrifié*?

In the very copious bibliography given by Mr. Ullmann I miss the name of Hans Sperber who, in the volume *Motiv und Wort* (1918), was the first to discover the mirroring of a writer's phobias in his vocabulary (offering examples comparable

to, e.g., the metaphorical use of *dérailler* by the hater of railways, Vigny, p. 32). In the very generous appreciation Mr. Ullmann has given to my own work I would take exception only to the statement that my "fundamental position [the psychological one, the one suggested by Freud] has remained unchanged" (p. 27). Mr. Ullmann has not been able to read my "Risposta a una critica," *Convivium*, XXV (1957), 597 ff., where I admit the applicability of psychological stylistics only to writers who think in terms of the "individual genius," of an individual manner of writing, that is, to writers of the eighteenth and later centuries; in previous periods the writer (even a Dante) sought to express objective things in an objective style. Precisely the insight that "psychological stylistics" is not valid for earlier writers (Montaigne being one glaring exception) has reinforced in me another tendency which was present in my work from the beginning, that of applying to works of literary art a structural method that seeks to define their unity without recourse to the personality of the author. Indeed the article on Diderot (1948) used by Ullmann as an example for my method is the last written by me in the Freudian vein.

LEO SPITZER

The Johns Hopkins University

TARAS SHEVCHENKO AND WESTERN EUROPEAN LITERATURE. By Jurij Bojko. London: Association of Ukrainians in Great Britain, 1956. 64 p.

Jurij Bojko, dean of the faculty of Arts at the Ukrainian Free University in Munich, presents in this study a new approach to Taras Shevchenko's literary heritage and his connections with Western European literature. Before World War I, literary historians and critics stressed the national and folkloristic elements in Shevchenko's works. In contrast to the recognition given other literary works of Western Europe, his artistic achievements were overlooked or neglected. To many literary historians of the populist tradition in Ukranian literature, Shevchenko was simply a born genius. His connections with Western European literature were usually not recognized.

With the revival of Ukrainian literature during the 1920s, a new view of the poet developed. However, the Russian Communists virtually banned Ukrainian studies in the early 1930s and under the Soviet regime the students of Shevchenko's life and works have been allowed to consider him only a peasant poet, the friend of Russia, etc. Many of his ideological poems were either omitted from his works or "re-edited" by Communist censors to eliminate anti-Moscow elements.

However, the new view of Shevchenko persisted abroad among Ukrainian emigrants. In Poland Pavlo Zajcev, in numerous articles and especially in his monograph, *The Life of Taras Shevchenko*, showed the poet as a highly cultivated person with close connections with the West. When Zajcev's monograph was published in Lviv in 1939, it was confiscated directly from the printshop by Soviet occupation troops and remained unknown until 1955, when it was republished by the Shevchenko Scientific Society in Munich.

Marietta Shaginyan, of Armenian origin, in her valuable book *Taras Shevchenko* published in Moscow in 1941 (second edition, 1946), seems to have borrowed the ideas of Zajcev, whose monograph she may have obtained while visiting Lviv in 1940. She portrayed Shevchenko not only as a great artist, but as one of the most advanced men of his time.

Although Bojko's book is similar, in some respects, to those of Zajcev and

Shaginyan, its most important contributions lie in its revelation of the extent of Shevchenko's relationship to the West. On the basis of the poet's correspondence and diary, we now know that he read at least the following European writers, many of them in the original (in particular, the French writers): Homer, whose songs he compared to Ukrainian epics (*dumy*), Herodotus, Plutarch, Virgil, Horace, Ovid; Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio, Ariosto, Tasso; Chateaubriand, Béranger, Barbier, Dumas (*père*), Balzac, Eugène Sue, Voltaire, and other Encyclopaedists; Shakespeare, Defoe, Richardson, Goldsmith, Burns, Byron, Walter Scott, Dickens; Goethe, Schiller, Koerner, Kotzebue. He knew Russian and Polish quite well and was well acquainted with Russian and Polish literatures. He did not know English, and read Shakespeare's plays in a Russian translation.

Bojko compares Shevchenko's works with works of Western European literature. He finds some influence of Burns in "Kavkaz," although he finds Shevchenko as a poet and as a national prophet much greater than Burns. Chateaubriand's "elegiac contrast of the transitoriness of human life as compared with eternal nature" (p. 22), a typically romantic phenomenon, is found in Shevchenko's "Haydamaky." Byron's "demonic individualism" (p. 22) was alien to the Ukrainian poet; nevertheless, Mykyta in his poem "Tytarivna" appears as "an image of satanic individualism" (p. 25) and is akin to Shakespeare's Richard III.

An analogy may be drawn between Shevchenko's "Zapovit" and "Rozryta mohyla" and Thomas Moore's "Irish Melodies" and Leopardi's "All'Italia." Bojko remarks: "The expanded image of Mother Ukraine, who 'like an orphan weeps on the Dnieper' reminds one so much of Mother Italy, the former mistress of half the world, who is now covered with blood and dishonoured, and weeps over her miseries" (p. 26).

Depicting the horrors of Ukrainian reality under Russian serfdom, Shevchenko makes a striking reference to Dante's *Inferno*:

> "My beautiful country, rich and opulent!
> Who has not ravaged thee? If one were to recount
> The true history of any
> One of our gentry, one could horrify
> Hell itself. And old Dante
> Would be amazed at a petty landowner of ours."
> (Page 35)

Adam Mickiewicz's influence is seen in Shevchenko's "Son" (The Dream); nevertheless the ideas of the Polish poet are developed here "broadly and boldly, excelling that of the author of *Dziady*" (p. 29).

After demonstrating convincingly that Western European literature exerted some influence on Shevchenko, Bojko warns that this influence should not be exaggerated. Shevchenko remained a poet of unique originality. Fundamentally a romanticist, he moved in the direction of realism in his later works. He denounced serfdom and became a defender of human rights, and he influenced many writers, especially in countries oppressed by a foreign yoke. Byelorussian, Bulgarian, Slovenian, and other literatures are deeply obligated to Shevchenko, who is beloved far beyond the borders of his native Ukraine.

Yet Western European histories of world literature continue to neglect the great Ukrainian poet. As Bojko points out, the lack of appreciation of Shevchenko in Western Europe "is entirely out of proportion to the greatness of his talent" (p. 7) and the significance of his works.

Bojko's valuable study is supplemented by a selection of Shevchenko's poems translated by Clarence A. Manning, Honorè Ewach, A. J. Hunter, P. Selver, and

Sunray Gardiner. We recommend this book to historians of world literature, professors of comparative literature, and especially to Slavists. It will prove an aid to understanding the character and excellence of Ukrainian literature and of its greatest poet, Taras Shevchenko.

YAR SLAVUTYCH

U. S. Army Language School, Ukrainian Department

FEDERICO GARCÍA LORCA. L'HOMME—L'ŒUVRE. By Jean-Louis Schonberg. Paris: Librairie Plon, 1956. v, 360 p.

En la cuantiosa bibliografía lorquiana hacía falta un libro de conjunto, como muchos otros de detalle, y el de Jean-Louis Schonberg es el estudio de conjunto que esperábamos puesto que el libro es en este caso merecedor de su propio título. Se describe en *Federico García Lorca. L'Homme—l'œuvre* en detalle y sin ambages todo lo que se sabe del hombre y se analiza todo lo que se ha publicado de la obra. Antes de decir qué es lo que nos hace falta todavía y por dónde se halla incompleto este trabajo, es necesario afirmar sus valores indiscutibles de investigación cuidadosa, de orden, de método y de franqueza. La anomalía sexual del poeta, tantas veces callada, se estudia claramente, y no por curiosidad malsana, sino como posibilidad que explicaría detalles de su vida, de su muerte y de su obra. Aunque se esté de acuerdo con el procedimiento de general, anotemos la exageración que le hace ver al crítico francés en Leda un criptograma invertido y secreto del nombre de Salvador Dalí (p. 217).

De lo mejor del libro es la síntesis histórica y biográfica, la descripción del ambiente madrileño, el análisis imparcial de los años de revolución social y de los últimos meses de la vida de Lorca. La influencia del contacto directo con las personalidades artísticas de Granada, Barcelona y Madrid, los pintores, músicos y escritores del renacimiento español del siglo XX, se presenta con vivo interés y perspicaz detalle. Entre ellos, se destacan la amistad de Lorca con Salvador Dalí y sus relaciones de discípulo y amigo con Manuel de Falla: dos puntos muy distintos que aborda Jean-Louis Schonberg con igual competencia. En cambio, las influencias literarias no se presentan con tanto detalle. Se señalan a menudo influencias francesas que quizá convendría relegar a un plano secundario, ya que es muy posible que le llegasen a Lorca a través de sus mayores o de sus coetáneos más estudiosos. Sin embargo, los contactos con la obra de Maeterlinck, por ejemplo, se comentan con certeza y muchas veces se dejan caer reflexiones y sugerencias que pueden muy bien llegar a ser la inspiración para uno de los estudios de detalle que más nos hacen falta, el de las influencias francesas en la obra de Lorca y sus coetáneos.

Si bien el estudio del ambiente y del hombre, que forma la primera parte del libro, es una síntesis muy útil, la segunda parte, dedicada a la obra, junta a numerosos aciertos un defecto en el enfoque de la poesía y varios casos de incapacidad parcial de comprender las poesías de Lorca. El centro mismo en que se coloca Jean-Louis Schonberg para estudiar la literatura es, cuando menos, extraño. Acepta el crítico sólo cuatro maneras de escribir poesía, una idea arbitraria desde ya, y además decide dar a cada una de estas posibilidades los nombres de momentos históricos y llamarlas "écoles" (p. 168): "romantique, réaliste, classique, et créationiste." El dar a estos téminos históricos un contenido arbitrario no nos desazona tanto como la poca cortesía de no informarnos de las bases teóricas que se usan. Como ejemplo de error parcial, mencionaremos el hecho extraño de que

se considere "inexplicable" un poema tan sencillo como "El niño loco" (p. 167). Este hecho nos lleva inmediatamente al problema más general de la exégesis de Lorca. Por desgracia, Schonberg no podía estar al tanto de los estudios simultáneos que parecen señalar en estos momentos el advenimiento de una nueva valoración, basada esta vez en la comprensión y el estudio minucioso de los textos. Pero veamos por qué podemos hablar de ceguera en el caso de "El niño loco":

"Yo decía: 'Tarde'.
Pero no era así.
La tarde era otra cosa
que ya se había marchado.

(Y la luz encogía
sus hombros como una niña.)

'Tarde.' ¡Pero es inútil!
ésta es falsa, ésta tiene
media luna de plomo.
La otra no vendrá nunca.

(Y la luz como la ven todos,
jugaba a la estatua con el niño loco.)

Aquélla era pequeña
y comía granadas.
Esta es grandota verde, yo no puedo
tomarla en brazos ni vestirla.
¿No vendrá ¿Cómo era?
(Y la luz que se iba dió una broma.
Separó al niño loco de su sombra.)"

Canciones (1921-24)

La sencillez de este poema es tal que bastaría indicar que se cuenta aquí el caso de un niño loco que juega con su sombra y que se halla con que se ha vuelto demasiado grande al atardecer y con que la noche le arrebata su precioso juguete. Dejando de lado las perspectivas posibles de símbolo general y humano, y personal del autor, el centro anecdótico de por sí es clarísimo. Las sugerencias que lo podrían enlazar con la anormalidad del autor y su obsesión aterrada de la muerte se le escapan inexplicablemente al crítico francés.

En cambio, como se ha dicho ya, hay aciertos numerosos, sobre todo en el estudio del teatro y de la prosa de Lorca. Aunque no todo es nuevo, se señalan con precisión los presagios dramáticos en la obra lírica ("c'est du romance gitan que Lorca a tiré le secret de la formule dramatique de théâtre," p. 211) y se analizan los dramas con cuidado. De interés especial es el primer capítulo de la segunda parte, "L'Essai," que estudia las influencias formativas en el adolescente. Señalemos también la valentía de un juicio crítico a contrapelo hoy en día, pero quizá más acertado que la corriente valoración excesiva de *El poeta en Nueva York*, del que nos dice entre otras cosas que "du monde américain en général, le poète nous trace une caricature vulgaire, sorte de lourde arlequinade qui n'a pas même le mérite du cocasse" (p. 221). Es deber crítico, aunque desagradable, advertir para terminar que las erratas en los títulos y citas en español son numerosas.

BERNARDO GICOVATE

Tulane University

SHAKESPEARES DRAMEN. By Max Lüthi. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1957. 474 p.

This book is planned as a kind of companion to Shakespeare. After a brief Foreword, it treats each of the plays in a separate chapter; the final chapter states the author's major theses; an appendix sketches the social, political, literary, and theatrical background and the bibliographical histories of Shakespeare's works and enumerates German translations and interpretations (from Wieland and Herder in the eighteenth century to Gundolf and Flatter in the twentieth). Finally, there is a list of recent scholarly works, largely German, followed by an index. Lüthi is evidently familiar with a wide range of Shakespeare *Forschung*, though an American reader cannot help noticing the absence from the index of names like Kittredge, Stoll, or Granville-Barker.

The value of Lüthi's book lies, however, in his own contribution to interpretation. Well aware of Shakespeare's relation to his own time, he is nevertheless concerned above all with his appeal to the present, with his universality. Shakespeare "spricht das Wort, das nur er und seine Epoche sprechen konnte; wir vernehmen es so, wie die unsere es vernehmen kann, das aber heißt: nicht in ganz gleicher Weise wie frühere Zeiten es vernommen haben."

Since Lüthi is a sensitive as well as an attentive reader, the results of his approach are interesting. As in H. D. F. Kitto's recent *Form and Meaning in Drama*, *Hamlet* becomes, in Lüthi's reading, a kind of religious drama (though he does not use this term). The play is "in accord with Aristotle's teaching that the ultimate issue in tragedy is not character but myth, the great action, the meeting of god and man." Somewhat like the *Oresteia* (though again Lüthi does not draw this parallel), *Hamlet* deals with the conflict between the code of revenge and a higher ethic (with the "Aufhebung des Rache-Ethos"); for, if Hamlet hesitates to fulfill the ghost's demand, it is because he darkly "senses that the world is not to be cured by revenge and judgment" ("daß die Welt nicht durch Rächen und Richten zu heilen ist"). Whether or not one accepts Lüthi's solution of the riddle of Hamlet's motivation, it is worked out in great detail and therefore full of suggestive light. His treatment of the other plays is equally rewarding.

Lüthi addresses himself, as he says, to the cultivated general reader of Shakespeare as much as to the specialist, and especially of course to the German reader. But he is certain to stimulate Shakespeare readers anywhere. Although he himself is Swiss, his book testifies to the sympathy which has led the Germans, ever since the great Schlegel-Tieck translation, to claim Shakespeare almost for their own.

CHRISTOF WEGELIN

University of Oregon

VARIA

A PROPOS DU MALENTENDU

Dans le dernier cahier de *Comparative Literature* (X, 1958, 233-240), M. Virtanen a attiré l'attention sur le sujet du *Malentendu* d'Albert Camus pour comparer la pièce française avec les drames de George Lillo et de Zacharias Werner ainsi qu'avec la ballade de *Billie Potts* de Robert Penn Warren, basés sur le même thème. Ce thème, comme on le sait, est celui d'un conte populaire qui circule depuis plusieurs siècles dans la tradition de différents pays. Dès le XVII^e^ siècle, on le trouve dans les chroniques de la guerre de Trente Ans, dans les sermons et dans les recueils d'anecdotes, dans les feuilles volantes et dans les livrets de colportage. Au XIX^e^ siècle, il est recueilli "de la bouche du peuple," sous forme de conte et de ballade, dans de nombreuses variantes qui couvrent un vaste territoire et, parmi lesquelles, les variantes galloise, chinoise et dantzicoise offrent des traits extrêmement curieux.

En outre, dès le début du XVII^e^ siècle, le thème revêt diverses formes littéraires : il s'incarne, en 1621, dans un récit français, au XVIII^e^ siècle dans une nouvelle italienne et dans un conte anglais, au XIX^e^ siècle dans un roman tchèque et enfin, au XX^e^ siècle dans un roman scandinave, dans un livret d'opéra français et dans la ballade américaine de Robert Penn Warren. Au théâtre, sa fortune est remarquable car il a inspiré une dizaine de drames, plus ou moins réussis, dont le plus ancien est, à notre connaissance, celui d'un jésuite polonais, publié à Cracovie en 1736. La carrière littérarie du thème a, elle-même, suscité toute une littérature critique et savante. Des érudits et des critiques tels que R. Köhler, J. Bolte, A. Wesselski, Otto Brahm, Jacob Minor, pour n'en citer que quelques-uns, lui ont consacré des études fort documentées.

Il ne semble pas que M. Virtanen ait tiré parti des travaux de ses prédécesseurs ce qui explique, peut-être, dans son article, quelques erreurs de fait.

M. Virtanen nous dit que Lillo a puisé son sujet dans *Newes from Perin*, que Werner a emprunté le sien à Lillo et que Camus devait "sans aucun doute" connaitre les vies antérieures de son *Malentendu*. Or, Lillo a pris son sujet non dans *Newes from Perin*, mais dans la chronique de Frankland qui en contient une forme altérée ; Werner a été inspiré non par le drame de Lillo, mais par un fait-divers lu dans un journal au cours d'une soirée chez Goethe, et c'est le poète de *Faust*, lui-même tenté un moment par ce sujet, qui a suggéré à Werner d'en faire une pièce pour le théâtre de Weimar ; quant à Albert Camus, nous savons par une lettre qu'il a bien voulu nous adresser, qu'il ignorait les œuvres qui ont précédé la sienne et qu'il s'est effectivement contenté du fait-divers cité dans l'*Étranger*, dont nous avons, par ailleurs, retrouvé la trace dans les journaux de l'époque.

C'est donc dans la chronique criminelle de leur temps que ces auteurs dramatiques ont puisé leur inspiration, persuadés, chacun à son tour, qu'il s'agissait d'un événement authentique et ignorant que d'autres s'en étaient déjà servis. Il faut, par conséquent, distinguer dans leurs œuvres, si l'on veut les comparer, les différences qui découlent de la variété des sources et celles, plus profondes, qui doivent être attribuées à des conceptions dramatiques particulières à chaque auteur. Il serait, en outre, intéressant de montrer pourquoi aucun des dramaturges, qui ont abordé un sujet en apparence si "tragique," n'a réussi à en faire une tragédie. Car il ne fait aucun doute que le thème du *Malentendu* est le type même du faux "bon sujet," probablement parce que l'on ne sait trop sur qui doit être concentré l'intérêt de la pièce : sur le fils assassiné qui disparait de la scène, tué dans son sommeil

sans savoir ce qui lui est arrivé, ou sur ses meurtriers dont le crime sordide, dicté par l'avarice, paralyse toute pitié chez le spectateur.

Cependant, de nos jours, l'anecdote du fils assassinée continue encore à fasciner les auteurs dramatiques et, avant d'avoir frappé l'imagination d'Albert Camus, elle avait déjà inspiré, au début de ce siècle, trois autres écrivains, dont deux Anglais et un Polonais. Ce dernier est le poète K. H. Rostworowski dont la pièce sur le même thème, intitulée *Niespodzianka* (*La Surprise*), fut jouée en 1929. Elle mérite d'autant plus d'être signalée que son auteur avait déjà donné, en 1917, un *Caligula*, comme le fera, une trentaine d'années plus tard, l'auteur du *Malentendu*.

C'est bien cette curieuse coïncidence qui nous a incitée à nous occuper de ce sujet sur lequel nous avons fini par rassembler une documentation assez complète. Nous espérons pouvoir bientôt la publier dans la monographie du thème et de ses ramifications littéraires que nous sommes en train de préparer.

MARIA KOSKO

Queens College

BOOKS RECEIVED

Alder, Alfred. The Education of the Individual. With a foreword by Carleton Washburne. New York: Philosophical Library, 1958. 143 p.

Agawa, Hiroyuki. Devil's Heritage. Translated from the Japanese by John M. Maki. Tokyo: Hokuseido Press, 1957.

Atkins, Stuart. Goethe's Faust: A Literary Analysis. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958. xi, 290 p.

Berger, Harry, Jr. The Allegorical Temper: Vision and Reality in Book 2 of Spenser's Faerie Queene. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957. xi, 248 p.

Brody, Jules. Boileau and Longinus. Geneva: Librairie E. Droz, 1958. 165 p.

Cordié, Carlo. Romanticismo e classicismo nell'opera di Victor Chauvet e altre ricerche di storia letteraria. Messina-Firenze: Casa Editrice G. D'Anna, 1958. vi, 401 p.

Des Périers, Bonaventure. Cymbalum Mundi. Texte établi et présenté par Peter H. Nurse. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1958. xlvi, 50 p.

Desportes, Philippe. Cartels et Masquarades. Epitaphes. Édition critique suivie du Commentaire de Malherbe, Publiée par Victor E. Graham. Geneva: Librairie Droz; Paris: Librairie Minard, 1958. 119 p.

Ernst, Fritz and Kurt Wais (editors). Forschungsprobleme der Vergleichenden Literaturgeschichte. II. Folge. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1958. viii, 199 p.

Flasche, Hans. Romance Languages and Literatures as Presented in German Doctoral Dissertations (1885-1950): A Bibliography. Bonn: H. Bouvier & Co.; Charlottesville: Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, 1958. xxii, 299 p.

Fox, Ruth Mary. Dante Lights the Way. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1958. xx, 370 p.

Gilman, Margaret. The Idea of Poetry in France: From Houdar de la Motte to Baudelaire. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958. xi, 324 p.

Goolden, Peter (editor). The Old English Apollonius of Tyre. London: Oxford University Press, 1958. xxxvi, 74 p.

Guthke, Karl S. Englische Vorromantik und deutscher Sturm und Drang: M. G. Lewis' Stellung in der Geschichte der deutschenglischen Literaturbeziehungen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958. 231 p. (Palaestra, Vol. CCXXIII.)

Hagstrum, Jean H. The Sister Arts: The Tradition of Literary Pictorialism and English Poetry from Dryden to Gray. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958. xxii, 337 p., 23 plates.

Heuser, Alan. The Shaping Vision of Gerard Manley Hopkins. London: Oxford University Press, 1958. viii, 128 p.

Howarth, Herbert. The Irish Writers (1880-1940): Literature under Parnell's Star. London: Rockliff, 1958. x, 318 p.

Jackson, Robert L. Dostoevskij's Underground Man in Russian Literature. The Hague: Mouton & Company, 1958. 223 p. (Slavistic Printings and Reprintings, Vol. XV.)

Korninger, Siegfried (editor). Studies in English Language and Literature. Presented Professor Dr. Karl Brunner on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday. Vienna and Stuttgart: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1957. x, 290 p. (Wiener Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie, Vol. LXV.)

Leo, Ulrich. Zur dichterischen Originalität des Arcipreste de Hita. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1958. 131 p. (Analecta Romanica, Vol. VI.)

Nagler, A. M. Shakespeare's Stage. Yale Shakespeare Supplements. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958. ix, 117 p.

Pellegrini, Giuliano. La poesia didascalica inglese nel settecento italiano. Pisa: Libreria Goliardica Editrice, 1958. 216 p. (Studi e Testi 14.)

Poggioli, Renato. The Phoenix and the Spider: A Book of Essays about Some Russian Writers and their View of the Self. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957. x, 238 p.

Pruner, Francis. Le theâtre libre d'Antoine: Le répertoire étranger. Paris: Lettres Modernes, 1958. 191 p.

Sala, Pierre. Tristan: roman d'aventures du XVIe siècle publié par L. Muir. Geneva: Librairie Droz; Paris: Librairie Minard, 1958. 262 p.

Shakespeare. Hamlet. Francis Fergusson, general editor. With a modern commentary by Maurice Evans. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1958. 255 p.

Shakespeare. Richard III. Francis Fergusson, general editor. With a modern commentary by Stuart Vaughan. Text edited by C. J. Sisson. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1958. 254 p.

Shakespeare. Romeo and Juliet. Francis Fergusson, general editor. With a modern commentary by W. H. Auden. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1958. 223 p.

Shakespeare. The Taming of the Shrew. Francis Fergusson, general editor. Text edited by Charles Jasper Sisson; commentary by Margaret Webster. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1958.

Slote, Bernice. Keats and the Dramatic Principle. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1958. 229 p.

Théophile de Viau. Œuvres poétiques, seconde et troisième parties. Édition critique avec introduction et commentaire par Jeanne Streicher. Geneva: Librairie Droz; Paris: M. J. Minard, 1958. lii, 233 p.

Tsao Hsueh-Chin. Dream of the Red Chamber. Translated and adapted from the Chinese by Chi-Chen Wang. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1958. xx, 329 p.

Valency, Maurice. In Praise of Love: An Introduction to the Love-Poetry of the Renaissance. New York: Macmillan, 1958. xi, 319 p.

Vyverberg, Henry. Historical Pessimism in the French Enlightenment. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958. x, 253 p.

TITLE: COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

VOLUME: 11 ISSUES: 1-4

DATE: WINTER - FALL 1959

PUBLICATION NO: 1024

NOTES: INCLUDES CONTENTS

THIS PERIODICAL MAY BE COPYRIGHTED, IN WHICH CASE THE CONTENTS REMAIN THE PROPERTY OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER. THE MICROFORM EDITION IS REPRODUCED BY AGREEMENT WITH THE PUBLISHER. DUPLICATION OR RESALE WITHOUT PERMISSION IS PROHIBITED.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS INTERNATIONAL, ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN